THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

Nos. 7, 8 & 9. OCTOBER—DECEMBER, 1943. Vol. XXXIII

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

The Memoirs of an Editor of the 'Church Times.'[1]

Some utterances are significant because of those who say them; other utterances are significant because of the things said. The recently published Memoirs of Mr. Sidney Dark, Editor of the *Church Times* for seventeen years (1924-1941) come in the first class. He is no theologian: he has no first-hand knowledge of Biblical Criticism: he is not a Church historian: but he is an extremely competent journalist, and under his editorship the *Church Times* far outstripped all ecclesiastical rivals in the British Isles. But although no theologian, Mr. Sidney Dark possesses firm ecclesiastical loyalties. He is a High Church Anglican, not, it will surprise some to learn, an Anglo-Catholic, for he has no leanings towards Romanism, nor does he believe that union with the Church of Rome would be otherwise than detrimental to the Church of England and the English people. He revered the old Lord Halifax, but came to see that the Malines negotiations were a profound mistake. In this he had the support of Bishop Gore. Mr. Dark writes that in England

> 'Suspicion of the Roman Church hardly exists among the most influential classes. Mgr. Knox has rhetorically declared: "You know the horror the world feels when somebody goes into a convent." That is an example of the rubbish to which Mgr. Knox is addicted. I have known a considerable number of men and women who have joined the Roman communion, but so far as the world has been interested in their conversion, it has certainly not felt any particular sort of horror. I have known

[1] *I sit and I think and I wonder.* By Sidney Dark. (Victor Gollancz, 1943; 8*s.* 6*d.*)

many ladies who have been called to take the veil, most of them within the Anglican communion, and I have never heard any horror expressed at this momentous decision. Mgr. Knox was of course anxious to claim for himself and his fellow-converts a martyrdom to which I am delighted to know they have never been exposed. Nearly all my convert friends have written books about their conversion, which have sold in considerable numbers, and some of them have found the road to Rome strewn with roses. In this country, at any rate, the experience never means anything like persecution. It has often meant pleasant notoriety.

The facts are that, while Roman Catholics in England are a comparatively small body, at least three-quarters of them Irish, they exercise an influence in key places out of all proportion to their numbers, and this is particularly true of the Foreign Office and the Press. There is no sort of doubt that it was this influence in the Foreign Office that was the main factor in determining the policy of Non-Intervention in the Spanish Civil War, and that has been responsible for the curious gentleness shown to Italy, and until recently to the Vichy Government in France. . . .

The Roman Catholic congregations are predominantly recruited from the poor, and mainly from the Irish poor. . . . It is not the rank and file of the Roman Catholic community that counts at all; it is the small body of astute men with a definite political and social philosophy and with a genius for pulling the strings behind those scenes where the pulling can be most effective. These are the people whom I fear' (p. 49 *ff.*).

The Anglo-Catholic party Mr. Dark regards as a declining power in the moral and spiritual life of the English people. He writes:

'At the beginning of the century, the Church was winning the confidence of the people. That confidence has been almost entirely lost. To the man in the street to-day religion is something divorced from reality. The Anglo-Catholic revival began with the assertion that "it is the Mass that matters." Now to a number of Anglo-Catholic priests it is only the Mass that matters. Here and there a priest like Basil Jellicoe has pulled down slums and built decent homes, inspired by contact with the divine in the Mass. But all too frequently ritual has become the priest's main preoccupation, with the teaching that the Church's one concern is the salvation of the individual soul, to be secured by regular confessions and frequent communions. . . . It is the teaching of the Anglo-Catholics, with the result that their sparse congregations consist mainly of elderly and frustrated spinsters and the rather unpleasant young men who love to wear lace cottas and serve at the altar' (p. 25).

Yet although he despairs of the Anglo-Catholic party, the ex-editor of the *Church Times* does not despair of the Church of England. He writes:

'It is truer to-day than it has ever been that the Church of England can influence social and political progress far more than any other religious body, and, as I have already contended, it possesses both the power and the prestige largely to determine the developments of to-morrow' (p. 49).

But if Mr. Dark does not believe in Anglo-Catholicism, he believes still less in the English Modernists. He writes:

'Modernism is a religion without a soul. It has no drive; it has no colour; it has no romance. It is adopted by cultured clerics anxious to

> have some sort of faith to justify the wearing of a dog collar, and by cultured spinsters of the school-ma'am type. But it is no sort of use for the workaday world that needs a refuge from the harshness of material experience' (p. 118).

Would it surprise Mr. Dark to learn that the majority of the members of the Modern Churchmen's Union are lay folk, and that most of the clerics who belong to the M.C.U. are not dons but parochial clergymen? Its members have included Canon Barnett (the pioneer of university settlements), Dame Henrietta Barnett (the creator of Hampstead Garden Suburb), the Rev. Edward Canney (the originator of rural holidays for slum children), Dr. W. D. Morrison (the prison reformer), the Rev. Charles Jenkinson (the slum-clearer of Leeds), Dr. Geekie-Cobb (the protagonist of reform in our marriage and divorce laws), Dr. Douglas White (the benefactor of Dumbarton), Henry Barran (the Yorkshire philanthropist), Sir Francis Fremantle (the Public Health specialist), Dr. A. J. Carlyle (the unflinching champion of the principle that a living wage for employees must be the primary charge in all industrial undertakings), Sir Arnold Wilson (a leader in burial reform), and such outstanding national servants as Dick Sheppard of St. Martin's, Canon Dalton (Tutor to King George V), Mr. Willett (the inventor of summer-time), and Lord Avebury (who gave us our August Bank Holiday — 'St. John Lubbock's Day'). There is no need to refer here to the contribution made by members of the M.C.U. to philosophy, theology, ethics and Biblical scholarship, since those who contribute come in that class of cultured clerics which Mr. Dark abhors.

Although Modern Churchmen may regard Mr. Dark's criticism as the product of that ignorance which lends wings to eloquence, yet it indicates the need for the popularization of the ideals of Modern Churchmen among the rank and file of the nation, three-fourths of whom are potential Modernists. The policy of the President of the Board of Education to make the teaching of religion essential and universal in the schools of the nation is opening up a sphere for Modern Churchmen where their services can be of the highest value and their influence most potent for good.

Mr. Dark's heartfelt conviction is that the brand of English Churchmanship which our present situation demands is a hard-working pastorally-minded Tractarianism combined with Christian socialist propaganda. Mr. Dark's supreme interest is in the propagation of Christian socialism, or, more correctly, Christian communism, and his ideal prophet in this field is not Dr. Temple but Dr. Blunt, the Bishop of Bradford. Mr. Dark writes:

> 'As I see it, it is the duty of the Christian priest who understands and accepts all the implications of Malvern to demand from his pulpit (and

> again in the name of the Lord) the nationalization of the banks, the land and the mines, because the private ownership of these essentials has been proved to contrive misery and frustration for the men, women and children for whom Christ died. If democracy is, as Dr. Temple has said, the system of government most in accord with the spirit of the Gospels, then the Church, brought into existence to implement that spirit, must be concerned that democracy shall function. Democracy is not an end in itself; it has no value except in what it can create. Its objective must be the greatest happiness for the greatest number; and since Christianity is a realistic religion and a materialistic religion, always urging its adherents to look facts in the face, the Church, that approves democracy, has to realize that the greatest happiness of the greatest number can never be secured without ruthlessly depriving the minority of the privileges and monopolies that bar the way to this goal' (p. 33).

This necessitates, as Mr. Dark clearly indicates, that the Church, led by her clergy, should give her support to a Left-wing political party—in short, that the Church should become a political partizan and triumph with the success of that political party. We regard this policy as dangerous to the survival of the National Church and as detrimental to her spiritual character. Moreover, it is by no means certain that the policy advocated by Mr. Dark would prove best for the English people. Our present Government's policy, which aims at a higher synthesis of the Right and the Left, has done much to justify itself and promises peaceful progress combined with national unity. Whilst we all unite in striving to be loyal to the Spirit of Christ, we ought, and must, be free both as English churchmen and English citizens to support whatever political party we think best, and we cannot countenance the turning of our Church's pulpits into political platforms.

Co-operative Christian Work in Worcestershire Factories.

The following extracts from the November number of *The Spiritual Issues of the War*, published by the Ministry of Information, is a cheering indication of what can be done in the cause of Christian unity and Christian evangelization under episcopal leadership:

> 'A remarkable war-time story of new links between Church and people comes from the Diocese of Worcester, where under the leadership of the Bishop, churches of varying denominations have co-operatively made contact with factories and other centres of public life.
>
> 'It began with the Day of Prayer on September 3rd, 1942, before which the Bishop of Worcester, Dr. Wilson Cash, met one hundred men at a Rotary lunch. He suggested to them that the Church would like to come to the people by entering the factories on the day of National Prayer. "You are beating at an open door," they replied; "we have waited for this for years." As a result a letter from the Bishop to factory managers was put in the hands of the clergy, who made their own contacts with factories on the strength of the letter. As a result, hundreds of meetings were held throughout the country on the first week-day of National Prayer.

'The next big step was the organisation of carol services in the factories at Christmas. These proved immensely popular. In some cases robed choirs were taken into the factories; in others the work-people themselves joined in community singing of Christmas carols.

'As Good Friday, 1943, approached, the Bishop was asked by various factories whether services could be arranged in the factories on that day. He cancelled his own engagements and took instead short services in six different factories; most of them were attended by thronging congregations, and the services were frequently relayed throughout the whole factory premises. In all, fifteen services were held on that Good Friday, and at the conclusion there was a mass service conducted co-operatively in the Baxter Memorial Church at Kidderminster. For this occasion Richard Baxter's chair was brought from the Parish Church and set up in the Congregational Church as a sign of fellowship.

'When September 3rd came round again there were once more a large number of factory services, and on this occasion contact with the people was widened by a large number of services held in public houses. Those making use of the bars were in most cases very ready to join in simple prayers for their friends at the front.

'Harvest Festival services were asked for, not only in public houses, but especially in a large busmen's shelter. The busmen, most of whom had allotments of their own, requested the clergy to arrange a Harvest Festival for them on their own club premises, which were duly decorated by them for the occasion.

'Contact with the cinemas has led to further opportunities for Christian witness as a result of new contacts gained. One large cinema which has a crowded children's matinée each Saturday has asked for a short service to be conducted for the children weekly. This is being done.

'In some factories the services have become regular events, and in one of them there is a fortnightly service for the day and night shifts respectively. A clergyman goes into the factory and conducts a service at 1 a.m. for the night shift.

'One factory has been so impressed by the work of the clergy that it has put aside a generous sum of money to secure the permanent services of a chaplain on its premises. The money provided covers a good part of a chaplain's stipend. Before taking over the work the chaplain appointed spent some time as an ordinary worker in the factory. He thus assured himself of the opportunity and the welcome which awaited him before embarking on his new work.'

We are sure that, if he could have been present, Richard Baxter, Puritan Saint and most indefatigable of English Parish Priests, would have been cheered by this self-denying venture of faith.

Two Urgent Reforms.

There are two urgent Church reforms which, we hope, may be achieved in no distant future under the leadership of our Primate.

(1) The first is the authorization of a fixed Easter. This depends upon the action and good will of the Church authorities in this country. The State has already done its part and waits upon the Church. In 1928, an Act, called Easter Act, 1928, 18 and 19

George V, ch. 35, was passed through both Houses of Parliament and received the Royal Assent. It fixed Easter as the first Sunday after the second Saturday in April. Clause 2 of this Act provides that the Act is to be put into operation by an Order in Council, and there is a further provision that 'before making such draft order regard shall be had to any opinion officially expressed by any Church or other Christian body.' This Act we owe to the exertions of Lord Desborough.

So far as we know, our Church authorities, although it is fifteen years since the Act was passed, have done nothing to make it effective. Why? 'Ecclesiastical conservatism,' some will answer; others will reply, 'Ecclesiastical inertia'; but neither of these answers is entirely correct. The correct answer is that the Roman Church does not favour this piece of calendar reform. In Italy, Spain, Portugal and Southern France their spring is later than in England, and so they are able to secure warmer and finer weather for the Easter holiday. Our need, from the public holiday point of view, is greater than theirs. Our English Church is becoming, it is believed, more sensitive in the sphere of social reform, and more sympathetic to all efforts intended to secure the increasing comfort and happiness of our working people. It is therefore incumbent on the Church authorities to implement this calendar reform at once. If the English Church is to wait upon the Roman Church in this matter, she will wait for ever.

Should this calendar reform be secured by Church of England support, it does not follow that our Church festival should of necessity be synchronized with the public Easter holiday. There are many cases in which attendance at our parish churches, and possibly our cathedrals, would be increased on Good Friday and Easter Day if the religious festival did not coincide with the public holiday. Indeed, whilst we strongly urge the securing of a fixed Easter for the purposes of the national holiday, we should be quite prepared to support the retention of the traditional method of dating our religious festival; but in any case, it is the social duty of the Church to give immediate support to implementing this popular measure of calendar reform.

(2) The second urgent reform demanded is that our Church authorities should issue a correct 'Table of Kindred and Affinity, wherein whosoever are related are forbidden in Scripture and our Laws to marry together.' This is essential because incumbents of parishes are required to set up this Table of Kindred and Affinity in the porches of their churches, yet many incumbents are unable to do so conscientiously because only the old and incorrect Table, in use before 1907, is obtainable. Why has the Church failed

during the last thirty-five years to provide a correct Table? It is undoubtedly due to the fact that the Church authorities have been unwilling to publish a correct Table which would give offence to many Anglo-Catholic clergymen.

The matter goes back to nearly a century ago and is the product of the long controversy which raged in church circles about the right of a man to marry his deceased wife's sister. The first attempt to legalize the marriage of a deceased wife's sister occurred in 1850, when a Bill to legalize such marriages was introduced into and passed by the House of Commons. The House of Lords rejected the measure, although it was passed some thirty times by the House of Commons. At last, in 1907, both Houses passed the measure, with the proviso that the right to contract such marriages was not legal for the clergy, nor were parochial incumbents required to solemnize such marriages in the case of their parishioners. They were, however, not permitted to refuse the use of their parish churches for such marriages provided other clergymen were ready to solemnize them.

The Table of Kindred and Affinity declares that a marriage with the deceased wife's sister is 'forbidden in Scripture and our Laws.' Since the Act of 1907 it cannot be truthfully asserted that such a marriage is forbidden in our Laws. Moreover, modern students of the Bible are aware that such a marriage is not forbidden in Scripture. Our Table of Kindred and Affinity is primarily based upon the Jewish prohibition contained in *Leviticus* xviii. In *Lev.* xviii, 18 this prohibition occurs:

> 'Thou shalt not take a woman to her sister, to be a rival to her . . . beside the other in her lifetime.'

This was interpreted by our Catholic canonists as prohibiting the marriage of a man with his deceased wife's sister. It does nothing of the kind. What it does prohibit is the peculiarly offensive form of polygamy, a man's marriage with two sisters at the same time, of which Jacob's marriage to Leah and Rachel was an example. Nowhere in Scripture is marriage with a deceased wife's sister prohibited. Indeed, it is by inference permitted, since marriage with a deceased brother's wife is not only permitted by Scripture, but in some cases even commanded. It is amazing, therefore, that our Church authorities, knowing these things, should not only have deferred the correction of our Table of Kindred and Affinity, but should have pressed our clergy in a number of cases against their conscience to set up this uncorrected Table in their churches. Again we look to our Primate to secure the long overdue reform in this matter.

A Staff College for the Anglican Communion.

Canon W. F. France, in the current number of *The East and West Review*, propounds a scheme for the creation of a Staff College where the Anglican clergy from the Dominions and the Foreign Mission Field could increase their knowledge and bring it up to date by spending a period as guests.

The maintenance of such a college would cost £12,000 a year, and we imagine that the capital required to found it and endow it would be at least £250,000.

We very much doubt whether such expenditure would be worth while. It is true that the best educated clergymen in this country are academically above the level of the less studious but hard-working clergy abroad; but a short period at a Staff Theological College in England, although it might provide a refreshing and interesting change for our clergy from overseas, could do very little to bring their studies up to date. Moreover, we are convinced that they could get what they need by reading the right kind of books and discussing them in societies of sacred study under the leadership of their own best men.

Before the Church of England can rightly spend large sums of money for raising the educational standard of colonial and missionary clergy, it ought to do much more to raise the educational standard of its own clergy. The number of clergymen who are being ordained without University degrees in this country, where almost any young man of average intelligence and real diligence can obtain a degree in our ancient or modern universities, is a scandal.

All that is required to remedy this is financial help. Now is the time for our Church Authorities to abolish all non-graduate Theological Colleges, or rather transform them into graduate Colleges, not by requiring a degree as a necessary qualification before entrance to such Colleges, but by requiring the possession of a degree before the candidate for Holy Orders can leave his College for Ordination.

We are not demanding that only graduates ought to be ordained. There are some notable cases where non-graduates ought to be ordained, especially elder men possessed of gifts and graces more valuable in the ministry than the qualifications which a degree confers. What we do demand is that a degree shall be the normal qualification and that our Ministry shall be a graduate Ministry (by which we mean that at least 95 per cent. should be graduates).

We recognize the advantages to be gained by Colonial and Missionary clergymen visiting England in order to study English Church life and its experimental developments. We are also of

opinion that residence for a term or two in a graduate Theological College in the vicinity of Oxford, Cambridge, or London, with attendance at refresher courses in the University, would be definitely beneficial. These visitors would be welcome and their stay would be advantageous to the life of the Colleges. Some would be gladly received as non-paying guests: others might well be paid for out of the special fund to be raised for that purpose in England. If American clergy could be included in such a scheme, all the better.

There is nothing grandiose in this proposal: it would be comparatively inexpensive: it would be entirely experimental: and it could be managed by a sub-committee in the Church House, Westminster. Moreover, it could be easily developed if it proved beneficial. We venture to hope that the far-seeing suggestion of Canon France may be implemented along these lines in the post-war period.

We recall the case of a Colonial bishop who proposed to come to England and use a Theological College in this way. We begged him not to do so, pointing out that the restrictions which such an environment imposed were ill-suited to a bishop. He replied, 'I may be a bishop; but I am also an Irishman, and I am coming.' He came and was the life of the community.

Romanist Propaganda and British Education.

Unitas (the 'Bulletin of the University Catholic Federation of Great Britain') published in its October issue a significant article on 'The Restoration of Christian Education.' It is an able exposition of Roman Catholic educational ideals, and is especially addressed to those engaged in the higher education of this country whether as students or teachers. It begins by expounding the close relation between the Christian Religion and our Western Civilization.

The break-up of Christian Civilization, so this article assures us, was inaugurated by the Reformation. After the destructive effects wrought on our Western Civilization by the Reformation came the devastating disaster of the French Revolution of 1789. Next ensued the disintegrating and disruptive influence of modern scientific education during the century and a half which followed on the French Revolution. The article maintains that Christian education alone can restore and rebuild our Western Civilization. It is convinced that if a Christian Civilization is to be built two fundamental principles must be accepted:

'(1) The independence of the Church, its spiritual authority over kings and subjects alike.'

'(2) The pre-eminence of Theology in Christian learning.'

The term 'Christian' in this article is merely the equivalent of Roman Catholic, and the term 'Church' means the Papal Church.

This being so, can anyone except a Roman Catholic regard these conclusions as sound? To-day, it is in the countries in which the largest Roman Catholic population exists that civilization is in the most parlous and debilitated condition; whereas throughout the British Empire, the Russian U.S.S.R., the United States of America, and the Scandinavian countries, where Roman Catholicism is comparatively weak or in some cases almost non-existent, the prospects of civilization are promising. Moreover, in these great communities the civilization is essentially Christian in its aspirations and principles, though not in some cases Christian in name; but after all, the name is not primary, and may be even misleading if Christian is to be identified with Roman Catholic and restricted to it.

We do not wish to make offensive comparisons; but has Europe ever known a worse civilization or a more evil government than that of the Papal States in which the spiritual authority of the Roman Church was supreme and whose educational method was based on the principle that Theology is the Queen of the Sciences?

In this country, there is strong belief in the need for Christian values in education and a strong desire that the Christian Spirit should permeate our schools, and that Christian character, conduct, and manners should distinguish the youth of our nation. On the other hand, there is a deep conviction that these results can be secured better by lay teachers than by clerics, provided that lay teachers are bent on achieving them.

The British citizen prefers lay Christianity to clerical Christianity, and feels that if religious education were in the hands of lay men and lay women, our religious difficulties in our national system of education would disappear; but until our lay teachers are encouraged and trained to make Christian conduct and character an indispensable product of national education, the nation will not secure what it desires. It is clear that our people desire national control, not Church control of religion in our schools.

It may not be possible at the present time to withdraw the parochial clergy and all ministers of denominations from teaching religion in our schools and to put the whole responsibility for Christian education in our schools into the hands of lay teachers; but the sooner this can be accomplished the better for the schools. The clerical 'right of entry' is a double evil: it fosters religious sectarianism and it reduces the responsibility of the lay teachers for the Christian tone and character of the school. We hope that Parliament will achieve the termination of this compromise as

soon as our lay teachers are competent to go forward without this hampering alliance. On the other hand, it must be recognized that the lay teachers cannot do all that is needful to secure the Christian character of their schools unless the parents do their part in the home and the clergy do their part in church and parish. Christian Britain does not desire the supremacy of the Church in education but the loyal service of the Church in the spirit of Christ.

H. G. Wells, in his recent Penguin, *Crux Ansata*, writes :

> ' I have been watching the current effort to subjugate this easy-going, profoundly sceptical country to the Roman Catholic Church with a lively interest. The process has been systematic and impudent to the point of incredibility . . . Steadily, persistently, the Catholic Church has worked for the destruction of that very liberalism which restored it to political influence ' (pp. 82-3).

Is not this latest effort of the University Catholic Federation of Great Britain yet another example of the many-sided Roman Catholic propaganda in this country attempting in the name of spiritual freedom to advance the domination of the Vatican?

A Modernist Confessor in Australia.

The Times of November 18th announced the death of Dr. Angus of Sydney, Australia. By the death of Dr. Angus, Australia has lost an eminent scholar, archaeologist, and theologian. It has also lost a fearless and influential Christian preacher and teacher, whose books and public utterances attracted wide attention. The best known of his published works are *The Mystery Religions and Christianity* (1925), *The Religious Quests of the Graeco-Roman World* (1929), and *Essential Christianity* (1939).

Some of our readers will recall that Dr. Angus as a Presbyterian Minister was charged with heresy and endured seven trials which extended for a period of four years, during which his wife died and his own health was impaired. The heresy charges were never fought to a clear issue, since such a result would in all probability have split the Presbyterian Church in Australia. At the seventh trial, in 1936, the Judicial Committee of the Presbyterian Church in Australia quashed the proceedings on the ground of some illegality in the first trial out of which the successive appeals had arisen.

Presbyterianism is more conservative in the Dominions than in Great Britain, and although Dr. Angus would have enjoyed peace with honour in this country, his adventurous fortitude has done not a little to advance enlightened Christian teaching among the younger generation in Australia.

ALEXANDER JAMES CARLYLE

AN APPRECIATION

By the Rev. W. B. Selbie, D.D., Principal of Mansfield College 1909-32, President of the National Free Church Council 1917, Hon. Fellow of Brasenose College, Oxford.

By the death of Dr. A. J. Carlyle, Oxford has lost a loyal and true son, the British Academy a distinguished Fellow, and the Modern Churchmen's Union one of its earliest and most convinced supporters. He had reached the end of a long, laborious unselfish life, wholly devoted to the twin causes of true religion and sound learning. He came to Oxford as an Exhibitioner of Exeter College in 1883. He had already taken a degree at Glasgow and so was a little older than the average undergraduate. This at once gave scope and opportunity to his qualities of leadership. He became President of the Union, and later on was its Senior Treasurer. He founded the Exeter College Church Society, which has had a long and useful career, and became known among his contemporaries as one who was particularly genial and sociable with Freshers and younger men. All through his life he showed singular facility in putting younger men at their ease and encouraging them to express themselves. It made him the highly successful tutor he afterwards became.

In Scotland, Carlyle had been the son of a Free Church Manse, but on coming to this country, and possibly influenced by the principle *Cujus regio ejus religio*, he found the transition to Anglicanism quite easy, and on taking his degree with a First in 'Greats' and a Second in Theology, was ordained and appointed to a curacy at St. Stephen's, Westminster. This he held only for a short time, but it was long enough to reveal to him the very evil conditions of life in the slums of Westminster and to stir up in him an interest in social betterment which lasted all his life. He was recalled to Oxford in 1893 to become Fellow and Tutor and subsequently Chaplain of University College. Here he settled down, as it proved to be, for the rest of his days. In 1895 Carlyle married Monti, daughter of the Scottish poet-preacher, Walter C. Smith. She was a wise and witty woman with a genius for friendship equal to her husband's, and she made him a most admirable help-meet. She had a certain literary gift inherited, no doubt, from her distinguished father, and it was in collaboration with her that her husband wrote his first book, *The Life of Bishop Latimer*. The choice of the subject was in itself significant. It indicated the trend which Carlyle was to follow all through his life, and the entire sympathy and mutual understanding between his wife and himself on religious matters. He once described himself as an

old-fashioned evangelical. But he was really a liberal evangelical, and that in the best sense of the words. His liberalism showed itself in his love of freedom, devotion to truth, and wise toleration of the views of others, and his evangelicalism in a firm belief in the saving and sanctifying power of the gospel of God's grace. But he made no claim to be a theologian, though his interest in the subject was very deep and real. He was an active member of Dr. Sanday's seminar, which did so much for the study of the New Testament in Oxford, and he took the keenest interest and played no small part in the work of the Oxford Society for the Study of Historical Theology. But his real subject was History, and he gave to it as teacher and writer the devotion of a life-time. Quite naturally, therefore, his approach to Christianity was mainly on historical lines, though he was by no means oblivious of the help to be derived from both reason and conscience in its interpretation. But he was all in favour of modern methods and research. He would have heartily endorsed the opinion of Archbishop Frederick Temple to the effect that

> 'He is guilty of high treason against the faith who fears the result of any investigation whether philosophical or scientific or historical.'

Thus it was in the field of History that most of Carlyle's work at Oxford was done. He taught and examined for the School of Modern History and had much to do with its reorganization. He took a very broad view of his duty and responsibility as an historian. To him History was more than a merely scientific investigation into causes and effects or a chronicle of events and experiences of the past without any particular meaning or aim. As he read it History had a meaning and a purpose, and to discover and interpret this was the aim of all his work. He could not conceive of history apart from sociology, economics and a host of other human interests. Hence it is not surprising that he should have been the first chairman of the Board that shaped the new Oxford School of Philosophy, Politics and Economics. Modern Greats or P.P.E., as it is variously called, owes much of its success to Carlyle's initiative and guidance.

Most of his work as a teacher in these two Schools was done not in lectures but by private coaching. He always had a plethora of pupils, but he gave them of his best. As one of them said to me, 'Tutorials with Carlyle were a liberal education.' Oxford is deservedly proud of her tutorial system. But it is not fool-proof, and its worth depends very largely on the personality of the tutor. Carlyle used generally to take his pupils one or two at a time. After a brief introductory essay by one of them he would throw the subject open for discussion. He encouraged questions, criticism, and the free expression of opinions while he himself walked up and down the room making his comments and criticisms, and

thus opening up the subject in a way that was both illuminating and suggestive. By such means he came to have for many of his pupils a personal influence and inspiration that lasted long after their Oxford days.

Much of Carlyle's success as a teacher was due to the fact that he never degenerated into mere donnishness. Though he was an Oxford don for most of his life he was also in the best sense of the term a man of the world, interested in all things human and keenly alive to the problems and perplexities of his time. His home very early became a centre of eager talk and discussion on matters of practical concern as well as of scholarship. Carlyle was very accessible and however busy he might be was ready to welcome visitors, of whom there were always many coming and going. As one of his closest friends wrote in the *Manchester Guardian*:

> 'There was an atmosphere about his house—one felt it as one stepped over the threshold—which was individual to the family and at the same time characteristic of Oxford. It was an atmosphere of benignity and loving-kindness, so complete that it was certainly unconscious and apparently effortless, accompanied with an unabated interest in scholarship and public affairs.'

In politics Carlyle was a liberal with a strong leaning to the Left, and in the end he joined the Labour Party. He was a consultative member of the Council of Ruskin College and entirely sympathized with the aims of its founders, though not quite happy about the way in which they were being carried out. His early years at Oxford saw the beginning of the movement for University Settlements. The bitter cry of outcast London had been heard and everyone felt that something must be done about it. My first acquaintance with Carlyle was at meetings in Sidney Ball's rooms at St. John's and Canon Fremantle's house in Ship Street, where we heard Samuel Barnett and others discourse on the problem of the submerged tenth. His reaction to it all was rather different from that of most of us. He believed in personal service, but not in salvation by culture. The problem of the slums was much too big to be solved by lectures, music and picture galleries. Behind it lay a host of other problems—wages, employment, prices, housing, education, sanitation, and the like. These were largely economic questions, and it was this aspect of the human situation that profoundly interested Carlyle. The study of it in all its social and political ramifications became one of his chief concerns. To him, however, economics was more than merely the 'dismal science.' He never lost sight of the human factors involved in it and of the close relation between economics, ethics and religion.

In 1895 Carlyle was appointed Rector of the church of All Saints' and St. Martin's in the High Street. This church was formed by an amalgamation of the two parishes of All Saints' and St. Martin's, Carfax, of which now only the tower remains. Its

incumbent holds the position of City Rector and may be regarded as a kind of permanent Chaplain to the Mayor and municipal authorities. This gave Carlyle an opportunity which he was not slow to use. He became a real link or *liaison* officer between Town and Gown, and played his part, unobtrusively but none the less effectively, in establishing the much happier relations which now exist between the two bodies. He held his office for more than twenty years, and they were years of unremitting toil. He still carried on the bulk of his University work, lecturing, teaching, writing, and attending Boards. In addition he had now to preach every Sunday, and though his parish was a very small one, it involved him in further work. For several years in succession he held a Bible class or study circle for parishioners in his house in Holywell. It was altogether like him to undertake such a work of supererogation. Carlyle was not a great preacher, but his sermons as Rector of St. Martin's and All Saints' are still remembered. One of the older City Fathers described them to me as simple, direct and practical, with a very real relevance to everyday life and its needs. On special occasions, he added, the Rector could always be relied upon to say the right thing and to say it well.

All through these years he was busy in many other ways. He made certain contacts with the world outside Oxford as Olaus Petri Lecturer at Upsala, Birkbeck Lecturer at Trinity College, Cambridge, as Lowell Lecturer at Harvard, as Select Preacher at Glasgow and Cambridge, and he travelled extensively on the Continent in the vacations. But this was all subordinate to the great task which was now beginning to occupy him, *The History of Medieval Political Theory in the West*, the first volume of which appeared in 1903. It is a massive and monumental work in six volumes. In it Carlyle had some help from his brother, Sir R. W. Carlyle, but the bulk of it is his own, and it puts him at once in the front rank of historians and political thinkers. The labour it involved was prodigious. In preparation for it, its author was credibly reported to have read through the whole two hundred and more volumes of Migne's *Patrologia Latina*! Certainly every page of it bears evidence of wide reading and the most painstaking research. But Carlyle wears his learning lightly. He can give chapter and verse for all his conclusions, but he is never unable to see the wood for the trees, and he is so fair-minded, so sober in his judgments, and so free from bias that he seldom fails to carry his readers along with him. This is not the place to review a book that has already become a standard work on its subject, but it may be worth while to call attention to its very great timeliness just now. All the great questions which are agitating the minds of men throughout the whole civilized world make their appearance in these pages. Here we can match the beginnings and trace the

development of theories of government, law, order, justice, and authority, of slavery and property, and the relation between the State and the individual, and the State and the Church. The book provides a real education in sociology and politics. It helps us to understand better a great deal that is going on in the world just now, and opens up for those that have eyes to see a prospect of better things to come. Much the same may be said of his book *Political Liberty*, published in 1941. It is even more relevant to the present world situation.

One other book calls for special mention. In 1917, in collaboration with Dr. Vernon Bartlet, Carlyle became jointly responsible for *Christianity in History*, a study in religious development. It appeared at an unfortunate time. The great war was at its height and men's minds were preoccupied, and the book never received the attention it deserved, for it is recognized by scholars to be quite the most outstanding contribution to its subject in modern times. Carlyle was responsible for the section on the Middle Ages. Brief though it is, it gives a survey of the period which reveals its author's powers of analysis and interpretation at their best. Here, too, he writes with an eye on the present as well as on the past, as the following quotation shows :

> 'The great conflicts of these centuries cannot be fully understood unless we make clear to ourselves that they represent one aspect of the great historical process, through which the modern world is reaching out to the appreciation of the autonomy of the spiritual life of the individual—that is one aspect of the development of individuality. For it is only very slowly that the individual is emerging from the primitive group. The process is indeed one, perhaps the chief, characteristic of the great movement of life which we call civilization.'

In 1930 Carlyle was appointed to a canonry at Worcester, the only preferment he ever received from his Church. He held the office till 1934, when he resigned it and gladly returned to Oxford. Two considerations influenced him. Though he took his turn at preaching and a full share in the administrative work of the Cathedral, he felt that the diocese was so well organized that he had really not enough to do. And he hankered after Oxford. He was anxious to finish his great book, and for that it was essential that he should be near the Bodleian. He had, too, missed his Oxford friends more than he had realized, and his delight at being among them again was quite touching.

Perhaps it may be permissible here to refer to two occasions when the present writer was closely associated with Carlyle and came to know him well. During the first great war, when his wife and family were, for some reason, away from Oxford, Carlyle occupied a set of rooms in Mansfield College. He was extremely busy doing the work of several tutors who had been called up, and coaching for sometimes as many as nine hours a day. But we met

often in the evenings, and over an after-dinner pipe and in occasional walks he used to talk freely and open his mind. He was profoundly affected by the war and by the loss of so many of the most promising young men he had known. But he never lost faith in the ultimate victory of right, and, like most of us in those days, was full of hope and schemes for the future. I could not but admire the steadfast and reasoned optimism which upheld him then and was to carry him through the days of disillusion that were to come. The secret of it was faith in a living God and a Providential order.

The second occasion on which we foregathered was in the year 1919, when there met at Oxford a Conference of twenty Anglicans and the same number of Nonconformists to discuss the question of the reunion of the Churches and to make proposals for future action. Of this conference Carlyle and I were elected joint chairmen and we presided over the sessions in turn. This involved a good deal of consultation beforehand, and I often had occasion to admire my colleague's ready grasp of a situation and his business-like way of handling it. In the course of the proceedings Carlyle only made one set speech, in which he contended that democracy was not materialist but essentially spiritual in character and aims. The conference itself reached a high degree of unanimity, removed a good deal of misunderstanding and made some useful practical proposals. It neither sought nor received publicity, but it prepared the way for others and many echoes of it were heard at Lambeth in the following year. In the subject it dealt with, the Reunion of Christendom, Carlyle was deeply interested, and he did everything he could, by his pen, by speech and by example, to soften the asperities of extreme sectarians on both sides. He had friends among them all, and however men might differ from him, they found it very difficult to resist the sweet reasonableness of his Christian charity. As long ago as 1902 he wrote an article on 'The Church' in the volume of essays entitled *Contentio Veritatis*. It concludes with the following very characteristic words:

> 'And therefore, though we lament (who does not?) the divisions and perplexities of our time, though we feel that the condition of the Christian Church is not that which it should be, we should surely try to do what we can under our present conditions, while we also try to remedy them, rather than stand on one side in a fruitless and unavailing anger or sorrow. For the Spirit of God still calls men to one life, the souls of men are still united in Christ, and the prayers of men still go up to one Father.'

In some ways Carlyle was typical of Oxford. He belonged to that devoted band of men who spend their lives in the teaching and administrative work of the University and ask nothing better than to be allowed to carry on and extend the great traditions of the place. Of these Carlyle was among the very best, and he lives again in the men and women all over the world who honour his

name and bear his mark. He was a good Churchman, but without a trace of bigotry or sectarianism, and no man was ever less ecclesiastically minded. He was also a Modern Churchman, but modernism with him was not the negative and iconoclastic thing it sometimes becomes, but rather a positive effort so to refashion the thought of the Church as to secure not a reduced but a transformed and revitalized Christianity. His intimate knowledge of the life of the Middle Ages revealed to him how closely the Christian Church was bound up with it all and how easily she adapted herself to it, not always for good. He realized the need for the same kind of re-adaptation at the present time. But it must be undertaken not in the interests of traditionalism, but with a single eye to the truth and in the spirit of the great motto of Oxford, *Dominus illuminatio mea.* For Carlyle was a man of God as really as any prophet of old. But he found the true service of God in the service of men. He was a Humanist in that he loved human beings and believed in them, despite their follies and sins. His sane, humorous, genial, but critical outlook proved very attractive and gave him real power over young and enquiring minds. His books are a lasting memorial of his genius as a scholar and interpreter of the past, but he has another and more precious memorial in the hearts of those who found in him a teacher sent from God.

THE NATURE OF MAN*

By the Right Rev. J. W. Hunkin, D.D., M.C., O.B.E.,
Lord Bishop of Truro.

IT has been very interesting of recent years to see the fundamental problem of the *Nature of Man* being attacked on four sides: the physical, psychological, philosophical, and theological.

Of the first, three notable examples are: *Man the Unknown*, first published in 1935, by a distinguished American surgeon, Alexis Carrel; *Diagnosis of Man* (1942) by Kenneth Walker of Harley Street, also a surgeon. I suppose neither of these writers would call himself a Christian; and in the case of the second this is not surprising, for he seems to know more about Buddhism than he does about Christianity. The third example I have in mind is a book by Sir Charles Sherrington, *Man on his Nature*, the Gifford Lectures for 1937-1938. Sir Charles, formerly Professor at Oxford, is an eminent authority on the brain, and a practising member of the Church of England.

* Paper read at the A.E.G.M. Conference at Cheltenham College in August and printed in *The Liberal Evangelical*, Sept. 1943.

Psychologists are, generally speaking, very wary of anything but a strictly practical approach to the subject. The question they set themselves to answer is not what is the nature of man but how it works. An exception is Dr. E. Graham Howe in his most recent book, *The Triumphant Spirit*, published this year. I have found it inspiriting, though I confess I have not been able to follow all the author's flights of fancy.

The philosophical approach is well represented by Dr. R. G. Collingwood's *The New Leviathan* (1942). Dr. Collingwood explains his theory in little numbered paragraphs, hard as diamonds, and often as brilliant. In a searching review (*Philosophy*, April, 1943, pp. 75-80) Dr. John Laird points out that Dr. Collingwood warns us repeatedly that the cardinal sin in this matter is to swap horses, *i.e.* to mix up 'bodily' with 'mental.' Oddly enough, however, it appears that there is only one horse (*op. cit.* 76), for in paragraph 2 (43) Dr. Collingwood writes: 'Man's body and man's mind are not two different things. They are the same thing, man himself, as known in two different ways.'[1]

The latest theologian to grapple with the subject is Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr in his Gifford Lectures (1939), *The Nature and Destiny of Man: a Christian Interpretation*. The first volume appeared in 1941, and was reviewed by J. E. Turner in the C.Q.R., Jan.Mar. 1943, pp. 252-255; by V. A. Demant in *Theology*, May, 1942, pp. 267-275; best of all by Edwyn Bevan in *The Spectator*, 23rd Jan. 1942, p. 87. Volume II, published a few weeks ago, was reviewed in *The Spectator* (23rd July, 1943) by Dean Matthews. Niebuhr's style is rather difficult, especially in Volume I, and some of his sentences are as heavy as lead. Edwyn Bevan quotes this one:

> 'Implicit in the human situation of freedom, and in man's capacity to transcend himself and his world, is his inability to construct a world of meaning which transcends the world beyond his own capacity to transcend it.'

Niebuhr's apparatus of abstractions is Scottish or Lutheran rather than English or Anglican. His method involves a good deal of repetition. I think it would have been better if he had given ten lectures instead of twenty. Moreover his treatment is theoretical rather than practical, and it is significant that in neither index do the words *Prayer* and *Worship* occur. The two volumes, however, give us an exposition of Christian doctrine by an independent and powerful mind. For his authoritative standard of Christian doctrine Niebuhr looks, as our own Thirty-nine Articles do, to the Bible. One result of following his lectures is a strengthening of

[1] For another review see G. de Burgh, *Hibbert Journal*, October, 1942, pp. 90-92.

the impression that there *is* what must be called (with certain qualifications) a Biblical doctrine of man. Another result is a refreshing sense of how reasonable and right the Biblical doctrine essentially is. Niebuhr is a writer who repays you for wrestling with him, and he illustrates his arguments with many searching and illuminating criticisms of theories and systems, ancient and modern.

All these works (and, no doubt, many others) are well worth careful study; but within the narrow limits of this paper I shall make no attempt to do them justice. I shall simply try to sum up very briefly the main results of my own reading and thinking, by way of introducing the subject.

The more we learn about the nature and constitution of man the less complete we perceive our knowledge to be. The human body is made up of some thousand billion cells, all living and active, and the whole activity integrated *as though*—this is how Dr. Walker puts it—a co-ordinating master-mind were at work.[2] More and more is being discovered about the mechanisms which are brought into action in this colossal cell-community, about the endocrine glands, for example, and the central nervous system. With regard to this part of our subject, the constitution and working of our bodies, all we can do is to accept what the trained physiologist tells us.

But beside the word 'body' we all use the word 'mind,' and we have no doubt that the word stands for something. Years ago, in a very able 6*d*. Benn, Dr. C. E. M. Joad discussed 'the mind and its workings.' His booklet is as inconclusive as the Doctrinal Report, but his own leanings are evidently towards the view that 'the composition of the living organism includes an immaterial element which we call mind,' which is more than a mere glow or halo surrounding the structure of the brain, and is active, dynamic, synthesizing, creative.[3]

Certainly mind appears to be something more than a physical explanation can cover.[4] But whatever it is, and whatever its relation to the brain may be, a man's best way of getting at it is the direct method of reflection—reflection upon his own mind. He must be trained, no doubt, in accurate unbiassed introspection, and then he must look straight into himself. 'Man as mind,' says Collingwood, 'is whatever he is conscious of being.'[5]

As to the nature of mind, man learns from himself and from other men. In this connexion, therefore, his central study is in

[2] Walker, p. 28.

[3] *op cit.*, p. 53.

[4] *cf.* R. R. Marret, *A Jerseyman at Oxford*, p. 15.

[5] *op. cit.*, pp. 1, 84.

the world of history and not in the world of Nature. To quote Collingwood again :

> ' For twentieth-century thought the problems of history are the central problems ; those of Nature, however interesting they may be, are only peripheral.' [6]

Let me reflect then on the nature of my own mind. It is clear that whatever my mind *is*, what it *does* is to *think*. Thinking, Plato said, is dialogue within the soul : and in order to think coherently we use language. The fact that language is necessary to coherent thought has some interesting implications. I learn language from other people, and I learn it with my ears and mouth. So that mentally I am both fundamentally allied with and dependent upon other people, and also bound up with my body in an extraordinary and indescribable intimacy.

Of the exact nature of the relation between mind and body I shall say no more in this paper. None of the theories on this subject satisfy me in the least. The relation between mind and body remains to me, at all events, a complete mystery. Of the relation between my mind and other minds I shall try to say a little more presently.

But there is another word which we commonly use and which stands for a real something, and that is the word *soul*.

> ' Where is the grave of Sir Arthur O'Kellyn?
> Where may the grave of that good man be?—
> By the side of a spring, on the breast of Helvellyn,
> Under the twigs of a young birch tree ! . . .
>
> The Knight's bones are dust,
> And his good sword rust ;—
> His soul is with the saints, I trust.'

I look forward to some sort of personal immortality. I am vague, I admit, about the nature of that life beyond the grave. Indeed, I am inclined to believe that we are not intended to know much about it while we are clothed with our mortal body. Anyhow, I freely confess I know nothing. But I am equally convinced that it is nearer the truth to postulate the existence of some kind of personal immortality than not to postulate it. I won't attempt to give my reasons here, but there seem to me to be good and sufficient reasons for my hope. Thus, when my arms and legs, my head-piece, and all the rest of my body moulder in the grave, I expect what I call my soul to go on. I am delighted with what St. Paul said : ' To depart is to be with Christ, which is far better.' I want that ' me ' which is the soul to go to be with Christ as a *good soul* : kind, courageous, sensitive, reasonable, unselfish — a soul of integrity. That's what we all want.

[6] *op. cit.*, pp. 18, 92.

Thus clearly I must conceive of myself as *body* and *soul*, *soul* being ultimately detachable from *body* in a way in which perhaps *mind* may not be. May we say that *soul* is the immortal element in *mind*? I don't see why we shouldn't. Let us then provisionally say that.

There is another important word which we use in order to refer to a real entity. It is a word avoided by most psychologists, but I am glad to see that Dr. Graham Howe uses it freely — the word 'spirit.' When we come to consider what we really mean by this word, I think it is best to start with the adjective rather than with the noun. 'Spiritual' conveys the positive notion which is indicated negatively by the word 'immaterial.' The soul is a spiritual entity. In his complex nature man belongs both to the natural order — the world-order which we can see with these eyes, hear with these ears, touch with these fingers, taste with these palates — and also to a super-natural spiritual order. The first order is a space-and-time order: the second is quite a different order. And the very highest element in man, his spirit, belongs to the other order.

Would it be true to say that the body belongs to the space-time, material, order? The mind is in time but not in space: the soul is neither in space nor time: and the spiritual is the highest, most essential element in soul. 'Man is the only animal,' says Niebuhr,[7] 'which can make itself its own object. This capacity for self-transcendence' which characterizes spirit in man 'is the basis of discrete individuality'; and again and again Niebuhr refers to the significance of the self-transcendence of the human spirit.

. . . . . .

God is Spirit: Posidonius said so many years before the Fourth Gospel said so. It is by virtue of his spirit that man is in vital contact with ultimate reality — with God Who is Spirit. The Divine Spirit both transcends all and also has an inner spiritual contact with all. In man, above every other created object, the Divine Spirit is in contact with an entity resembling Divine Spirit — the Spirit of God in closest touch with the spirit of man.

As long as man is alive in the present order of existence body-mind-soul-spirit are one unified indivisible whole. His inmost centre is pure spirit, but he can hardly move without his body and he cannot think without his mind. To think he must use language, so that all I have been trying to convey to you about man's real constitution has to be conveyed in language. I can only offer you picture-language: indeed, that is all I can offer myself. It is only

[7] I, p. 58.

in that mirror that I can view the reality. Only thus can I find either for myself or for anyone else the expression nearest to the ultimate truth that I can attain.

If, then, this is the best picture available for us of the nature of man, let us look at it a little more closely. It shows that the individual man is not really the separate entity he seems from the bodily point of view to be. Individuals, indeed, are more separated as far as their bodies are concerned than in any other respect. In thought they are intimately united by their common use of language. There is no thought without language, and no language is a private individual affair. No person exists in isolation. His relations with other persons are vital to his very existence as mind — to go no further or deeper than that. Personal relationships, then, are of absolutely fundamental importance in human life. No one, of course, would deny it.

Here it would not be irrelevant to refer for a moment to telepathy. The best examples seem to occur sporadically and spontaneously — not to order. Some persons appear to be much more gifted in this respect than others. Few of us, I suppose, would maintain that there is nothing at all in telepathy; and I am strongly disposed to think that the phenomenon takes place directly between minds and not on the bodily, physical, plane. This is a tempting subject, but time forbids our following it further now. I must ask your attention to another point.

The picture of human nature which I have been trying to present suggests the importance also of the integration in due proportion of the whole man: body, mind, soul, spirit — the spirit in its true position of dominance. Further, power, spiritual energy, vital for growth and development, comes from above, through the living contact of the spirit of man with the transcendent-immanent Spirit of God. The first word of all true worship is *Sursum corda*, 'Lift up your hearts': the second, 'The Lord be with you—and with thy spirit.' Aspiration and adoration are the very heart and soul of worship.

All this I believe to be true; that is to say, the nearest to the truth that I can get. But as long as I am in the body and belong to the time-space order as well as the spiritual order, I must face the two together. I must make the best use I can of the picture-language which is all I have at my disposal, and I must be resolutely realistic.

Just now I used the word 'aspiration.' The word implies a desire for more than has yet been attained. As a human being I am conscious of imperfection: and, more than that, I am conscious of evil. The existence of evil is indeed a mystery: nor can I explain its status in reality. But there it is, around me and within

me. I need deliverance, redemption. The whole creation needs deliverance, redemption. And the hope of it is from above.

That ultimate highest reality of Spirit is not less but infinitely greater than the human spirit. The human spirit is personal, is the very centre about which human personality crystallizes. The Divine Spirit is not less than personal : infinitely more, no doubt, but certainly not less. The picture-language used by the greatest religious teachers and personalities is justified — is, indeed, inevitable. God Incomprehensible : revealed as Father-Creator, Son-Redeemer, Spirit-Inspirer : but not three Incomprehensibles, One Incomprehensible (Latin *immensus*, not to be measured by human thought).

Redemption has proved to involve suffering. The Saviour became Himself a sacrifice — 'The Son of Man came not to have servants but to be a servant, and to give His life a ransom for many.' The way of redemption is the way of service like our Lord's service, of sacrifice like our Lord's sacrifice, of suffering like our Lord's suffering : and to follow along that way to service and sacrifice and suffering ourselves, we need the inspiration and reinforcement of the Holy and Divine Spirit of Christ and of God.

The worst evil that enters into the life of man is sin. I need not attempt an exact definition of sin. In more than one passage (*e.g.* I, 198) Niebuhr maintains that the basic sin is pride. But I am glad to see that on p. 242 he slips in self-love as well : 'Without question Biblical religion defines sin as primarily pride and self-love.' At all events I think it would be generally agreed that sin arises chiefly in connexion with those personal relationships which are the very warp and woof of human existence.

The mind of man has a power of making judgements. The mind makes aesthetic judgements as between what is beautiful and ugly; the mind makes moral judgements as between right and wrong, good and bad. The mind in the act of making moral judgements is often called Conscience. I was surprised to read the outburst of Dr. Graham Howe against conscience :

> 'If theologians and philosophers had been doctors,' he writes, 'and had seen the human conscience so often playing its major part in a patient's mental and emotional disease, they would not, I think, speak as kindly of it as they sometimes do. . . . Conscience can be the very devil in our lives, and it can be a constant source of melancholy.' [8]

Of course we see what Dr. Graham Howe is driving at, but we must recognize his paradox for the paradox it is. The power of the mind to form aesthetic and moral judgements is one of its most distinctive, vital, fundamental powers. If the mind is untrained or unhealthy its aesthetic and moral judgements are liable to be

[8] *op. cit.*, p. 230.

wrong. But that is not to say that there are no right judgements or no methods of improving our powers of judging. I think most of us feel that this is one of perhaps the few respects in which our powers increase if and as we grow healthily older. Our juvenile judgement of what is beautiful was cruder than it is now; and similarly our judgement of what is right and good.

It is true, of course, that when the conscience becomes morbid it may be a cruel tormentor. But the safeguard here is the great truth of forgiveness. In the Creed we say we believe, not 'in sin,' but in 'the forgiveness of sins.' As there is healing for the body there is also healing for the mind and soul. The *vis medicatrix Naturae* entails the healing activity of countless red blood corpuscles and involves incalculable suffering. The *vis medicatrix Spiritus* entails immeasurable healing activity and involves inevitable suffering. And as regards our own part in the age-long process of redemption, what matters most is that we should never become dispirited. The way of Christianity is the way of acceptance of suffering that is inevitable, the way of endurance, 'the way of a passionate will-to-live to the utmost, in spite of every obstacle and temptation to the contrary.'[9] So Dr. Graham Howe, under the heading 'Getting down to it,' makes eight recommendations, of which the seventh and eighth are as follows:

> 'Use your spiritual will if you can: vibrate, with a peculiar intensity, the high bright will: lift up your heart: call: knock.
>
> 'Use the power of words (in prayer, perhaps), ardently, eagerly, but not aggressively. Life is a prayer, and praying is the trick of it. But don't forget that prayer is only one of Life's essential tricks. Prayer is the heart of Life itself, and there is nothing special about it, except our use of it.'[10]

Sin occurs, as I have already said, chiefly in connexion with human relationships. We belong to each other so much more profoundly than we commonly realize, we are bound in the same bundle of life with one another; the whole organic unity of which we are members may so easily be poisoned by us or poison us. No man can be perfectly happy till all are happy; or really free from sin till all are free from sin. And what is of primary importance is not so much individual acts of sin as the low state of spiritual and moral health which exudes these lamentable incidents. Deliverance comes through an infusion of more of the Spirit from above —'*It is always the Spirit that matters.*'[11]

Nor should this experience of deliverance be sought in isolation.

> 'But thou would'st not *alone*
> Be saved, my father! *Alone*
> Conquer and come to thy goal,
> Leaving the rest in the wild.'

[9] *op. cit.*, p. 213. [10] *op. cit.*, p. 220. [11] *op. cit.*, p. 225.

These familiar lines from Matthew Arnold's fine tribute to his father understate the case. No man *can* be saved *alone*.

> 'Heaven's gates are shut to him that comes alone.'

If it is natural and right to pray in private, and in secret to seek spiritual communion with God, it is still more natural and right to take our part in corporate worship.

> 'Though private prayer be a brave design
> Yet public hath more promises, more love,
> And love's a weight to hearts, to eyes a sign.
> We all are but cold suitors; let us move
> Where it is warmest — leave thy six or seven;
> Pray with the most; for where most pray is heaven.' [12]

Holy Communion was from the first designed to be a communion with one another as well as with our Lord. What, I think, needs great emphasis in the new programme of religious education is the necessity of worshipping together if we are to work together to the best advantage.

Looking back now over what I have written, I observe that I have said little explicitly about feelings. There was, indeed, an implicit reference to feeling in what I said just now about mind. Thinking, in the sense in which I used the word, is always accompanied by feeling. In the older text-books of psychology it is pointed out that cognition, emotion, and volition always go together, though one or other may predominate in any activity of the mind as a whole; for the mind always is active as a whole.

In the language of poetry the heart stands for feeling, but of course the physical organ called the heart is not the seat of feeling. Feeling accompanies a great deal of bodily, and all mental, activity; but it is a mistake to pay too much attention to our mere feelings as such.

> 'Let present Rapture, Comfort, Ease,
> As Heaven shall bid them, come and go—
> The secret this of Rest below.'

There are people who would tell you that all they want is a little happiness, and by happiness they mean pleasant feeling. But to pursue happiness as an end in itself is like pursuing sleep. That is not the way to attain it: it only eludes us. Happiness and sleep supervene on their own account in the right context under appropriate conditions. We do not fall asleep till we give up trying to go to sleep; happiness comes to us without our thinking about it when our powers find the scope for which they are fitted.

[12] George Herbert, *The Church Porch*.

The analogy of sleep may further serve to remind us that in his moral and spiritual development man also needs periods of rest.

> 'Drop thy still dews of quietness
> Till all our strivings cease.'

There is a time for developing like an athlete: there is also a time for developing like a flower.

In conclusion, with ideas like these at the back of our minds, we may return to the Bible. The Bible contains an authentic word of God, but its revelation must be spiritually discerned. In the Bible the nature of man and the relation of men to one another, to Nature, and to God, are all expressed in picture-language, the pictures being drawn from everday life—the home, the king's court, the court of law, the field, the market place. The Biblical picture-language has by no means lost its significance, and cannot easily be improved upon.

But even within the canonical library of the Bible itself there are differences of tone and shading. There is more than one view of man to be found within its covers. From the beginnings of Hebrew religion to the highest New Testament teaching real progress stands out unmistakably. We ourselves, you and I, did not invent that just and penetrating delineation and estimate of man which is given as a culmination of Christian thinking in the Gospels and in the writings of St. Paul and St. John. We receive it most thankfully, with eagerness and humility, as children of God, beginning to learn. At the same time we can receive it only with such minds as we have, the product of the twentieth and not of the first century.

My subject is the nature of man, not his destiny. I am very glad that it is so. Niebuhr maintains that the destiny both of man and of the human race is beyond history. Quite so: at all events it is much too far off for us to descry what it is. We look ahead, we peer as far ahead as we can, and what we see for the individual is the long process of the making of a personality in communion with God, and what we see for the race is the long process of developing the truly Christian humanism of a City of God. The final victory is beyond our utmost vision, and it is well that it should be. At our present state of development final victory would be fatal to the spirit.[13]

[13] Graham Howe, *op. cit.*, p. 208.

INDOCTRINATION OR EDUCATION?

By S. R. Woods, M.A., Headmaster, Cotham School, Bristol.

'Since I have been a university teacher and a teacher of modern subjects, I have felt strongly that a tutor ought to take the greatest care not to try to "convert" his pupils. The business of a tutor is to awaken the critical powers of his pupils, to teach them to think clearly and impartially and to weigh up the arguments for and against a question. If university teachers use their opportunities as teachers to act as missionaries for any cause, if they try to indoctrinate as well as to educate, the results in the larger sphere of politics will, sooner or later, be the disappearance of academic freedom. Sooner or later, if the teacher allows himself to become an instrument for political conversion, the authorities responsible for his appointment and promotion will see to it that he is preaching a gospel acceptable to them.'

E. L. Woodward, *Short Journey*, p. 232.

'. . . In the teaching profession it is obvious that young students cannot be subjected to the vagaries of individual teachers. In this sense, the claim for freedom of teaching is nonsense. . . . The State of Tennessee did not err in upholding the principle that there are limits to the freedom of teaching in schools and colleges. But it exhibited a gross ignorance of its proper functions when it defied a professional opinion which throughout the world is practically unanimous.'

A. N. Whitehead, *Adventures of Ideas*, p. 65 (Pelican Edition).

TO distinguish between 'education' and 'indoctrination' is not to pass a moral judgment upon either. They are alternative methods of training, with their attendant advantages and disadvantages. The former assumes that freedom of thought is the child's birthright and holds that the purpose of the school is to enable the child to realize that freedom. The latter maintains that the purpose of the school is to inculcate that conception of the good life which is held by those who control the school and which the child, if left free, may fail to choose. The argument of this article is that we are trying to combine secular 'education' with religious 'indoctrination.' The advocates of religious instruction in schools tend to be unwilling to accept in the teaching of religion that principle of freedom of thought which controls the teaching of the so-called secular subjects.

In this country freedom of thought is the considered basis of political relationships, for democracy is that form of polity which arises where men are determined to preserve intellectual liberty. This principle of freedom may be dangerous; wrongly used it may lead to social anarchy or individual damnation, but at the present moment—ignoring certain war-time restrictions—it exists in this country. Adherence to any particular religious, social or economic theory is not a condition for citizenship or any form of civic employment.

The right of free enquiry is the natural corollary of such political freedom. There is no fixed pattern into which new knowledge must be capable of being fitted to gain acceptance, and new discoveries may involve the rejection of old theories. The so-called secular subjects know nothing of any self-validating knowledge, exempt from criticism and independent of proof, whose truth is guaranteed by its origin. We may speak of a man as the greatest 'authority' upon this or that subject, but we do not mean that we are under any sort of obligation to accept what he says as true. The phrase means that a critical examination of his conclusions has so often proved them to be true that we have come to rely upon his judgment. But his conclusions never become exempt from criticism, and he remains an 'authority' for us only so long as we continue to believe that the available evidence justifies his judgments. The ordinary individual will always be dependent upon the expert, but the expert is not he who can dispense with evidence; rather it is that he who can produce the evidence is regarded as the expert.

Thus the supreme fault of any democratic system of education is that it should fail to respect the child's freedom of thought. But the child is not born with a mind already stocked with knowledge and a capacity for right judgment already developed. Freedom may be his birthright, but he has to realize his freedom. During the period of his immaturity he must be protected until he is capable of personal and competent judgment. Some 'formal' system of education is necessary, involving a deliberate selection of experience, a fixing of the content of that which is taught. The fundamental problem is so to choose that which the child is taught that in the process the child's ultimate freedom is not destroyed.

For the democratic state to fix and determine the content of that which is taught would be a violation of its own nature and would be to restrict the intellectual freedom of both teacher and pupil. We who teach in this country are filled with admiration for those of our colleagues who in other countries have denied the right even of totalitarian states to destroy academic freedom and who in defence of this principle have been willing to face the pain and torture of the concentration camp. But it is equally clear that the choice of that which is taught cannot be left to the individual teacher. If each individual teacher is permitted to teach as true, and to use his official position to act as a propagandist agent for, his own conception of the truth, there is a reversal to the authoritarian system of training as practised in the totalitarian state, without that unity of teaching which is its main justification. There would be a legion of petty educational despots instead of one educational dictator. There is no difference in principle between

'Mussolini is always right' and 'It must be true; teacher says so.'

The solution of the problem is to restrict dogmatic teaching to that which it can be reasonably assumed the child would freely accept as true, if it possessed the capacity and knowledge to make a competent personal judgment. What this would be cannot be determined with scientific or philosophic precision, but in practice the best guide is professional opinion throughout the world when it is practically unanimous. In the realm of the controversial, *i.e.* that about the truth of which competent opinion is divided, we must be content to discuss and not teach. Propagandist teaching, an attempt to convert the pupil to one particular opinion of the several that are intellectual possibilities, is not permitted. The boy must be permitted to weigh the evidence for himself and reach his own conclusion. The schoolmaster is judge but not jury; his duty is to see that the boy's decision is the result of knowledge and reflection rather than of ignorance or prejudice. In this way the intellectual liberty of both teacher and pupil is preserved. The former is not compelled to teach as true that about the truth of which he is doubtful; the latter's freedom of choice is respected on any matter that is controversial.

This principle of freedom of thought is, I believe, accepted in the teaching of the so-called secular subjects. I speak with most confidence of my own subject — History. The 'facts' of history are items of historical knowledge about the truth of which historians are generally agreed. These facts I teach as true, giving no evidence and permitting no criticism. A statement in an examination paper that was contrary to a fact I should cross out. I make it clear to the boy that ultimately he has the right to determine for himself the truth even of facts, and that any student will be assured of professional approval and honour who can prove the error of any previously accepted fact. But for the moment facts must be accepted. This omission of evidence is merely a labour-saving device. The evidence exists and is generally held to be valid, though it may be impossible to bring it within the four walls of the classroom or may be of a nature which the child as yet is incapable of appreciating. I do not claim either for myself or the text-book the right to dictate truth. But historical teaching is not limited to facts; even a cursory glance at any examination paper will show that the questions involve also an appreciation of the facts, and in the realm of judgments a variety of opinions is permitted. Originality and independence of judgment are merits. I do not in an examination paper cross out an opinion because it differs from my own, nor do I penalise the writer.

An example from my own personal experience may make my argument clear. I was for many years a history master and a

speaker for the League of Nations Union. In this latter capacity I felt I had the right to indulge in propagandist teaching. The members of my audience were free to attend or stay away; they knew the purpose of the meeting and were aware of my personal bias. They were free to reject what I said, and therefore an attempt to persuade them by reasonable arguments was not to limit their freedom. But in the classroom my attitude had to be entirely different. The boys were compelled to attend, and age, experience and the control of discipline gave my words a fictitious authority. My pupils were not entirely free agents, and therefore, since I had to admit that universal disarmament and collective security were matters of controversy, I was bound to try and be impartial. I could say that they were matters upon which every future citizen had to make a decision but I could not dictate this decision nor attempt to influence it.

In so far as divergences of religious opinion are limited to denominational differences this same principle controls the teaching of religion. The denominational susceptibilities of parents must be respected. It is roughly true to say that religious teaching in State schools must be limited to that about the truth of which the Reformed Churches are agreed, and in many schools an 'agreed syllabus' is used which contains that which is acceptable to the Anglican and Free Churches. But the assumption upon which rests the legitimacy of an 'agreed syllabus' as a basis for dogmatic teaching is that variations of competent religious opinion are limited to denominational differences. This assumption is not true. I may personally regret the existence of the Unitarian, the Agnostic, or the Secularist, but I do not think that as a schoolmaster I have the right to ignore their existence, for the State does not regard them as unworthy of citizenship nor are their views proof of moral depravity or intellectual incapacity. The fact that has to be faced is that not even the most fundamental elements of the Christian faith now come under the heading of that about the truth of which competent opinion is generally agreed.

I know that it may be argued that the Secularist is by definition excluded from the category of 'competent opinion.' Just as the man who is tone-deaf is incapable of a competent opinion on things musical, so one who lacks any religious experience, any consciousness of the existence of God, cannot express a competent judgment on religious matters. But unfortunately for this argument, whereas there is general agreement that tone-deafness is an insurmountable bar to musical appreciation and the capacity to distinguish tones is generally accepted as a normal and valid mode of experience, so that its absence is regarded as an imperfection, there is not the same unanimous attitude towards religious experi-

ence. There are those who deny its validity, pointing out the variety and conflicting nature of the truths claimed to be known in this way and the impossibility of any verification by methods generally acceptable.

There is therefore this vital difference at present between the teaching of religion and the so-called secular subjects. The teaching of the former, omitting denominational differences, is avowedly missionary and propagandist. Though the truth of that which is taught is not generally accepted by competent opinion, dogmatic teaching is desired and an impartial discussion of the truths of Christianity either is not wanted or is felt to be insufficient. The aim of such teaching is exactly the reverse of that which Mr. Woodward feels to be the function of a university teacher. In the teaching of the so-called secular subjects public opinion will not tolerate propagandist teaching. In the realm of the controversial, there must be discussion but not dogmatic teaching. To employ the phrases which form the title of this article, the distinction is between 'indoctrination' and 'education.' This, I assert, is the crux of the problem of the place of religion in schools.

Religious teaching that accepted completely the principle of freedom of thought and restricted dogmatism to that about the truth of which competent opinion was agreed would, I believe, be welcomed in schools. I have consistently used the somewhat cumbrous phrase 'the so-called secular subjects' because I believe that the distinction between religious and secular knowledge is unreal. Religion is knowledge thought of as a whole; it is a synoptic view of knowledge. The so-called secular subjects are abstractions from the unity of knowledge, useful but artificial and misleading in themselves until they are brought into coherent relationships with each other. If, therefore, to quote Whitehead,

> 'Rational religion is religion whose beliefs and rituals have been reorganized with the aim of making it the central element in a coherent ordering of life—an ordering which shall be coherent both in respect to the elucidation of thought and in respect to the direction of conduct towards a unified purpose commanding ethical approval.' [1]

then there cannot be education without religion, for the whole purpose of education is to enable the boy to attain such an ordering of life.

Judged by this aim our educational system at present is inefficient. The great criticism that can be levelled against the school as it exists to-day is that it is concerned almost exclusively with the process of analysis of knowledge and ignores the equally vital process of synthesis. We teach and examine a number of separate subjects without reference to their relationships one with another,

[1] *Religion in the Making*, by A. N. Whitehead, p. 20.

as though they were complete in themselves, forgetting that they are but abstractions from the unity of knowledge. We do not help the boy to frame a philosophy of life or to find a 'central element in the ordering of life.' We are therefore accused of turning out boys who are erudite but uneducated, or, as I would prefer to say, boys who 'in respect to the direction of conduct' lack 'a unified purpose commanding ethical approval.' The fact is that our present system of education, because it lacks a moral and intellectual unity, is essentially irreligious.

I suggest also that such religious teaching would be efficient. A religion that was a synthesis of the content of the various subjects of the curriculum, which used them as evidence and, by bringing them into coherent relationship, made them intelligible, would probably be effective in controlling conduct. I have always felt, for example, that it was a tragedy that the teaching of religion and the teaching of history should be unrelated. I am aware of the difficulties that attend any attempt to formulate a philosophy of history. History deals with the unique and therefore history never repeats itself, yet it remains true that history, being the record of social and political relationships in past time, forms an important part of that *corpus* of knowledge of which any philosophy has to take account. A philosophy is not likely to be valid which ignores history or is not exemplified in history. If God is in history, He is in contemporary English history as well as in the history of Palestine in the Old Testament period. But I do not know whether a form would be more shocked if the schoolmaster tried to explain Jewish history in terms of geographical controls without reference to God or suggested that Divine assistance was one of the reasons for English success in the Seven Years War. What would be the reaction of a School Certificate examiner who found this latter suggestion in one of the scripts he had to mark?

I would add that, since to teach competently knowledge as a whole requires at least as much training as to teach competently any part of knowledge, I would welcome as a colleague one who had specialized in the study of the philosophy of religion. A specialist teacher of this kind, who could act, so to speak, as a leader of a discussion group, would be an asset to any school. Similarly, I believe that specific time would continue to have to be allotted to religious instruction but religion would cease to be merely a school subject. It would be something that permeated the whole activity of the school. Every lesson would be a religious lesson, in the sense that its content would provide part of that *corpus* of knowledge which, in the more specifically religious lesson, would be viewed as a whole. Every member of the staff would be a teacher of religion, for he would be providing part of

the evidence upon which that religion would be exemplified. In this way we should recapture that spirit of unity which was the glory of the Middle Ages and there would be—which now does not exist—religious education, education unified and directed to a moral end.

The price that we have to pay for religious education of this kind is that the boy shall be left free to choose his religion, for a variety of religious beliefs is the inevitable consequence of freedom of thought. Some boys will choose a religion which we who teach will think false or inadequate. This we may regret, yet I think we have to admit that, because such a religion was the boy's free choice and, in his opinion, a satisfactory synthesis of his experience, it is more likely to be ultimately better for the individual and the community than a religion that was imposed or enforced.

It may be that this kind of religious teaching is impossible. It may be that in religion, because of its supreme importance, we ought to secure that the boy chooses rightly rather than that he chooses freely, and that someone, the State or the individual schoolmaster, must take the responsibility of deciding that which is right. In short, we must be content with religious instruction instead of religious education and accept the idea of religion as one school subject amongst many. If the existing staffs of schools are unwilling or incompetent to teach the religion that has the stamp of orthodoxy and authority, a specialist teacher must be introduced whose orthodoxy is guaranteed and whose function it would be to gain the boy's allegiance to the officially approved religion.

Such religious instruction, being avowedly missionary and propagandist, would be a denial of the principle of freedom of thought in one of two ways. Either it would be based upon some authoritarian theory of knowledge, the infallibility of Bible or Church, or it would teach dogmatically one of the several religious opinions that were intellectual possibilities. An attempt would be made to influence and determine the child's choice of religion. The questions that have to be faced are what would be the effect of such teaching upon education generally and would such teaching be efficient.

The answer to the first question has already been given. If religion is a school-subject, then education lacks aim and purpose; it is reduced to the teaching of a series of specialist and unrelated subjects. To use the jargon of our profession—we lack an 'integrated curriculum,' for there is no single secular subject of admitted primacy to which the other subjects are willing to stand in subordinate relationship. If the religion that is taught makes no claim to be a synthesis of the specialist subjects but accepts itself the status of a specialist subject, or if it is a synthesis which the teachers of the so-called secular subjects in the main reject, then either the school lacks a philosophy to give it point and

direction, or the boy will try to build a philosophy upon the limited foundation of the subject in which he has specialized.

The answer to the second question is, I think, equally clear. Though from the standpoint of organization it is perfectly easy to regard the teaching of the Christian Faith as nothing more than a school-subject with so many periods a week and a specialist teacher, yet the content of that teaching is bound to overlap the content of the teaching of the other subjects of the curriculum. A religion that is a way of life cannot be confined within the limits of a single school subject; it is always bursting its bounds. If therefore the teaching of religion is authoritarian in character, whilst the teaching of the other subjects is controlled by the principle of freedom of thought, the boy will find that the certitude that the one asserts is challenged by the doubts which the others admit. There will be contradictions and incompatibilities between the content of the religion and the content of the other subjects, if the one is a fixed body of doctrine and the other a continuously expanding *corpus* of knowledge. You cannot have miracles in one period of instruction and an implicit, if not an explicit, denial of miracles in another and expect the teaching of both periods to be effective. The two teachers may not be conscious of the contradiction, but the boy will be, and sooner or later he will have to choose between them.

My argument, in short, is this. If authoritarian, propagandist teaching is necessary in religion, we must be willing to reconstitute the school, limiting the freedom of thought in the teaching of the other subjects and making certain that nothing is taught in those subjects which is not in complete harmony with the religion. This involves religious tests for teachers. Alternatively, if we wish to preserve freedom of thought in the so-called secular subjects we must be willing to accept exactly the same principle in the teaching of religion. If the process of analysis be free, the process of synthesis cannot be enforced.

There is one final point. The era of freedom of thought may be coming to an end. It may be that in the future men will regard social unity as more valuable than individual liberty and material comfort as more important than intellectual freedom. There is, perhaps, a real risk that the schools in the future may become instruments of propaganda for an official religion, but that religion is more likely to be some economic and political theory than the Christian Faith. This is the lesson of recent events in other countries. No one has more to gain from the preservation of freedom of thought than the Churches. To maintain freedom in education should be the common aim of both teachers and clergy. Are the Churches so afraid that the 'free-thinker' must be a non-Christian that they are unwilling to permit freedom in the teaching of religion?

BODY-MIND AND IMMORTALITY

By the Rev. J. C. Hardwick, M.A., B.Sc.

THE traditional view of the soul as an immaterial entity inhabiting a material body made belief in immortality comparatively easy; but this traditional view is almost universally rejected by biologists, physiologists, psychologists, neurologists, and men of science generally, who find no place for the soul in their analyses of the human organism.

An exception, or apparent exception, to this view is the contention of the distinguished neurologist Sir Charles Sherrington, elaborated in his book *Man on His Nature* (1941), that though all other organic phenomena can be interpreted without remainder in terms of energy, this is not the case with mind.

> 'Not so long ago, expectation was entertained by many that mind would with the growth of knowledge prove to be energy of some form, as yet perhaps not delimited. . . . This expectation has not been fulfilled. Further knowledge has not brought them together. It has more definitely parted them.'

The organ of *liaison* between mind and matter is the brain. Yet Sir Charles Sherrington, after fifty years' study of that organ, says that reference to it at present affords little help to the study of the mind; the 'how' of the *liaison* between them remains for science, as for philosophy, a riddle. Between energy and mind science finds no 'how' of give and take; there is co-existence, and that is all. To man's understanding the world remains double.

This *impasse* is no new thing, and great ingenuity has been employed in the vain attempt to overcome it, ever since Descartes essayed to bridge the gap with his 'animal spirits'—an entity neither material nor immaterial, but a hybrid and therefore a possible link, but which subsequent physiological researches disposed of. And in any case such a device would have involved an infinite series of intermediate links, and so complicated rather than solved the problem.

Inasmuch as it is impossible to understand how an immaterial soul or mind can act upon, or even 'into,' a material body, the obvious course is to attribute real existence to the material body only and to say that the mind is an illusion and consciousness an 'epiphenomenon.' Such a course is more obvious than the alternative one of attributing reality to the mind only and relegating the body to the realm of 'appearance,' though logically the one is as legitimate as the other. And as a matter of fact the metaphysical difficulties in the way of regarding the body alone as real are as great as those to be met by the advocate of the sole reality of the mind. But the ordinary man naturally prefers to regard as real the

object that is visible and tangible. The body can, while the mind cannot, be perceived by the senses, and 'seeing is believing' for most of us.

Yet it should also be obvious that though I cannot perceive my own mind by any organ of sense, I am nevertheless aware of its existence. Indeed, Descartes based his whole philosophy upon the reality of consciousness, and claimed that in so doing he was building upon a hypothesis which was incontrovertible. Whatever might be disputed the reality of thought could not.

But besides these two alternatives of rejecting the reality of either body or mind, there is the *tertium quid* of preserving the reality of both — not, however, as a duality in the manner of Descartes, but as a unity. If 'body' and 'mind' both exist as realities, may it not be that they constitute one reality and not two? Instead of speaking of a body *plus* a mind, may we not speak of a 'body-mind'? In this case the apparently insoluble problem of 'interaction' would simply not arise. It would be seen to be an artificial problem arising out of an unnecessary and illegitimate subdivision of a unity into a duality, as if one should create a problem of interaction between the concave and convex aspects of a curve by conceptual analysis.

On this view of the 'body-mind' as a unity, the mental, conscious or 'psychic' side of our make-up would be our 'interior' aspect, while the material or bodily side would be the 'exterior' aspect. The former would be the organism as it is known to and experienced by itself, whereas the latter would be the organism as it is known to and experienced by the outside observer.

Nor need this 'two-aspect' view be confined to the organic sphere only, still less to that section of the organic sphere which is more obviously equipped with mind. Nature is certainly one, and even inanimate Nature may be held to have its inner or psychic or mental side as well as its physical or outer aspect. It is true that this 'inner' aspect of inanimate Nature is closed to us, and indeed it may be rudimentary enough. But is not the 'inner' aspect of our fellow-men largely closed to us? No man can get inside his fellow's skin. We are all from the psychic aspect isolated beings, and it has been suggested that we have acquired bodies only as organs of communcation! Whether we have means of penetrating into the 'inner' side of other persons independently of physical devices like speech is a point that cannot be discussed here, though it does seem to be the case that telepathy is an actual experience and has been confirmed as such. It seems to be the case, too, that certain individuals — and perhaps most individuals at certain periods of their lives — through some 'mystical' faculty can penetrate into the 'inner' side of Nature as a whole.

And lest the idea of Nature having an 'inner' side seem entirely fanciful, it may be observed that our present popular notion of 'dead' matter is in reality no older than Descartes; such a notion would have seemed strange to the ancients — for example to Thales, who attributed souls to amber and the magnet — Plato, Aristotle, and to the mediaeval schoolmen. It is not commonly realized that the conception of 'dead' matter is a highly metaphysical one. Thus 'mind' and 'matter' may both alike be regarded as abstractions, the concrete reality being a psycho-physical entity, the principle applying to every rung of the biological ladder, and even to the sphere below it, *i.e.* to that of 'inanimate' Nature.

The question whether or how the 'inner' side of the organism can establish contact with the corresponding 'inner' side of other organisms, or even of the inorganic world, has already been mentioned. The parallel problem of how the 'inner' self perceives the 'outer' world is solved by the senses, which translate the physical world, or certain selected aspects of it, into mental terms. This of course is why the mind cannot be perceived by the senses, since what is already mental cannot need translation into mental terms.

But how does this view of the human organism as a 'body-mind' affect the possibility of immortality? At first sight it appears unfavourable to such an idea, since when the organism dies and disintegrates it should follow that both inner and outer aspects are dissolved together. The constituent physical or psychical elements no doubt survive, but the organic whole comes to an end; the body-mind unit ceases to exist as such.

It was remarked above that the 'inner' side of the organism becomes aware of the 'outer' world through the senses, which translate the physical into mental terms. Now other organisms — their outer aspect, that is to say — are themselves part of this exterior, 'material' world which is mediated through the senses. These senses, however, conceal as much as they reveal, inasmuch as they only reveal what they are capable of revealing. If our present senses had a wider range of sensitivity, instead of being able to register only sound and light 'waves' of a certain limited frequency (a mere octave out of a whole piano keyboard), we should be aware of a different 'outer' world to that which we now perceive. Or alternatively, if we were equipped with a new group of senses, sensitive to X-rays or to 'electricity' as our present senses are to light waves, our new world would be unrecognizable.

From this it would follow that the 'outer' aspect of our neighbour, which constitutes our total perception of him, need not necessarily be the complete 'outer' aspect of his 'inner' being. There may be a 'remainder'—how extensive we cannot say—which eludes

our limited sense perceptions, and so cannot be 'externalized.' Perhaps this was the point of Blake's saying,

> 'Man has no body distinct from his soul; for that called body is just a portion of soul discerned by the five senses, the chief inlets of soul in our age.'

It may be added, too, that just as the 'outer' aspect or 'body' of our neighbour is 'just a portion' of his total being, so the 'inner' aspect of himself that each man is aware of is 'just a portion' of his psychic whole, as the Freudian psychology teaches. Thus both from the point of view of the 'body' and from that of the 'mind,' the human individual may be far more extensive than is commonly supposed.

If we accept Blake's equation of the 'body' with that portion of the 'soul' which is accessible to the five senses, *i.e.* an 'exteriorization' of a portion of the 'soul' or whole being of the individual, then it follows that the 'body' is no mere 'material' object. It is a portion of the 'soul' made visible and tangible. It can no longer be regarded as a material machine inhabited by an immaterial soul (Descartes' view), as animistic theories represent it as being. In fact, just as vitalistic theories ignore the dynamic nature of matter, so animistic theories ignore the 'spiritual' nature of the body. They only put back what has been in imagination removed but in reality has been there all the time.

The question no doubt arises why the 'soul' should 'exteriorize' itself at all. Why should the 'body-mind' have this exterior manifestation, which in any case (according to Blake's theory) is only partial? It may be, as St. Augustine thought, that body is the organ by which mankind establishes contact with the objective world; as it is also the instrument through which that world discloses itself when regarded as 'objective.'[1] Or as a friend of the writer recently put it in a letter *à propos* of Sir Charles Sherrington's book:

> 'Possibly the development of Mind requires the discipline of confinement in a worldly material individual with all its very evident and tiresome limitations (against which the individualized mind invariably rebels) in order to fit it for its next stage of growth; perhaps it was a dilemma only ingeniously solved (the mind is ingenious) by the device of becoming part of the physical world and accepting its limitations so as to appreciate properly the advantages of non-spatial and non-temporal existence. It seems to me a mistake to investigate mind by experiments on its agents in non-mind. The result will only be knowledge of those agents, *i.e.* physics, not psychology.'

How far are the foregoing ideas favourable to a belief in immortality? Sherrington's view would seem to be a dualism, but this would not preclude the idea of the 'body' being the mind's

[1] See C. N. Cochrane, *Christianity and Classical Culture*, p. 437.

instrument, whether of communication with other minds, or otherwise; and this instrument the mind might use and then relinquish. It is true that Sherrington says that in our experience mind is always united with a physical organism, which suggests that no mind could continue to exist apart from such organism. But this may be due to the limitations of our experience, which are such as to preclude our becoming aware of a mind save through its 'body.' Just as an object which absorbed instead of reflecting light rays would be invisible to us, so a mind's exterior aspect, or 'body,' might be out of range of our perception and knowledge. We are indeed here in the region of speculation, but if mind is admittedly beyond the range of the senses it is also beyond the range of the sciences and speculation becomes legitimate. We speak of 'body' as the exteriorization of 'mind,' but a mind might be able to display any number of 'exteriorizations,' *i.e.* have any number of 'bodies' to display as replacements, so that when one was finished another might come into existence. After all, any 'physical' object has as many 'bodies' or 'exteriorizations' as there are senses to perceive it. A rose's scent is one body, its colour another, and so on; what we perceive is a composite body, the simultaneous perception of several bodies. Thus Sherrington's view, stressing as it does the irreducible reality of mind as against those who seek to reduce it to a manifestation of physico-chemical energy, seems to keep open the possibility of immortality, though he leaves his readers free to form their own opinions on that question.

But if we take Blake's view of the body as that portion of the 'soul' or self which is perceived by the senses, it is conceivable that this might not be indispensable to the self's survival. Though it might seem to follow that the self would be mutilated by the loss of this part of its equipment (so to speak), unless it could somehow be replaced.

It is worth noting in any case that if we accept some unitary 'body-mind' conception of our present existence, the same, or a closely parallel, conception will have to be carried over into the new sphere of existence which 'survival' would involve. It is true that about such a sphere of existence we are entirely without knowledge, and necessarily so, since it would lie outside the range of sense-experience. But if similar conceptions are to be applied to it as apply in our present sphere, it will involve the twin aspects of 'interior' and 'exterior' once more. It may be that the present 'interior' aspect might become 'exterior' in relation to some entirely new aspect, so that what was formerly 'mind' becomes the 'body' of a new type of existence.[2]

[2] Compare Alexander's theory of mind being the 'body' of the new quality of existence — deity.

Students of the New Testament may wish to establish a connection between the above conceptions and the Pauline theory of a 'spiritual body.' The Pauline belief was definitely in a 'resurrection' (as Kirsopp Lake has pointed out) rather than in 'immortality' independently of a body. There would be a transmutation of the mortal body, and the substitution for it of a 'spiritual' body which would be 'incorruptible.' In so far as the Pauline belief was a part of, or coloured by, current Jewish apocalyptic ideas, the transmutation of the body would be one aspect of a more wholesale transformation, *i.e.* of the present world into a new world from which death had been altogether banished. It certainly does seem to be the case that a 'resurrection' of a body would necessitate the provision of some kind of environment within which it could function, though our speculations with regard to such a world are inevitably restricted by our inability to picture an existence not conditioned by space and time.

From one point of view the idea of a 'spiritual body' may not seem so inconceivable. From the standpoint of inanimate matter, a living organism is already a 'spiritual' body, since it introduces a new quality of existence, even though it consists of elements derived from the inanimate world. You cannot touch a living human body with the same indifference with which you would touch a stone, because you are aware that it is alive and sensitive.

To return to Paul, it is worth noting that he does not speculate about the new spiritual world which will be the environment for the new spiritual body; such speculations are to be found in generous measure in the book of *Revelation* — a characteristic piece of apocalyptic literature containing some fine imaginative passages. What Paul does do is to describe, so far as is humanly possible, and with admirable restraint, the spiritual body itself, and this is all that is required, since if a man acquired a new body, he would at the same time acquire a new world. And the wider the difference between the two bodies, correspondingly wider would be the difference between the two worlds.

The Pauline description of the new body is so familiar that its originality and power may easily be overlooked. He draws a parallel between the insignificant, dead-looking seed on the one hand, with its miraculous transformation into the flower, more rich and fair than Solomon in all his glory, and containing the promise of rare fruit, and the poor, pitiful corpse, on the other hand, with its destined glorious body immune from death and decay:

> 'It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption; it is sown in dishonour, it is raised in glory; it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power.'

The new body's characteristics will be vitality, beauty, and power. Perhaps this gives us a better idea what that 'other life' means than do the highly-coloured pictures of the Apocalypse.

THE JEWISH PROBLEM

By the Rev. James Parkes, M.A., D.Phil., author of *The Jewish Problem in the Modern World*, etc., etc.

REPORTS from all quarters speak of a steady increase of anti-Jewish feeling in England. The information comes from too many reliable sources for its truth to be denied; and the seriousness of permitting antisemitism to spread unchecked should be too evident for it to be ignored. Antisemitism to-day is not a problem which concerns Jews only. A Christian should be prepared to combat it in any case, for group hatreds can never have the sanction of Christian sentiment. But to-day it is not merely on grounds of Christian morality that we should take seriously the report that anti-Jewish feeling is increasing. For only the blindest can close their eyes to the fact that the spread of antisemitic feeling has been the most universal and the surest weapon in the armoury of Fascist assaults on democracy. Ever since Bismarck experimented with it in 1879 to attack the National Liberals, antisemitism has been used as a weapon, not to attack the Jews, but through Jews, to attack any kind of progressive or democratic enemy. Between 1879 and 1914 exactly the same technique was applied in Austria-Hungary, Russia and France. In some cases the antisemites destroyed themselves, in some they destroyed their enemy. But in every case they brought suffering on the unfortunate Jewish people and spread the poison of anti-Jewish prejudice. Nor can it be overlooked that in these political activities all the great Churches of the continent, Roman, Protestant and Orthodox, seriously compromised themselves. The complete breach between organised religion and progressive movements which has been an unhappy feature of political life on the continent during the past fifty years owes not a little to this situation. The only parties which kept their hands clean of this evil in their opposition to *bourgeois* liberalism were the various Socialist parties.

After the last war antisemitism appeared again as one of the most valuable weapons in the armoury of Fascism. Hitler quite openly claimed that it was the surest way of securing an entry into other countries in order to undermine their stability and their democracy. Official Nazi organizations spent on its propagation millions of pounds yearly. Yet in the countries in which the propaganda was spread the issue was universally treated as a purely Jewish issue, and little or no support was given by non-Jewish bodies, either religious or political, to enable the unfortunate Jews to combat the flood of poison poured out by the *Fichte Bund* in

Hamburg, the *Anti-semitische Weltdienst* in Erfurt and the Berlin Institute for the Study of the Jewish Question. The folly of this indifference has now been abundantly manifested in the quisling movements of almost every country; but it is still doubtful whether Gentiles or Christians in any number have taken to their hearts the lesson that *antisemitism is a danger to our whole society*, and that to view with indifference the growth of anti-Jewish stories is an ostrich-like policy.

It is on this background that the present situation in England needs to be considered. Real cases of ill-feeling have to be treated seriously, because they allow of the entry of the virus; evidence of the deliberate stimulus of antisemitic feeling needs to be taken still more seriously as showing that, in spite of the war, in spite of the general hatred of all that Nazism stands for, in spite of the measure of real sympathy and indignation aroused some months ago by the reports of the massacres of Jews in Hitler's Europe, there are still agencies at work which believe that by starting the red herring of Jewish plots and Jewish wickedness the British can be again led into a false view of their situation, and misled as to the nature of their enemies.

A period of war inevitably produces certain phenomena. As the years go on, increasing war-weariness and bitterness, and the increasing frustration of normal spiritual and peace-loving values, dull the conscience, and make people ready not only to be irritated by trifles, but also to welcome quack explanations of the tragedy of their position. Stories circulate with more than their usual rapidity; little actions produce more than their normal irritation, and a little carefully-placed propaganda can produce considerable effects.

All this can be illustrated from the increasing anti-Jewish feeling in the country. There have been three fields in which the necessary minimum of actual facts has led to immense exaggerations. They are the Black Market, the evacuation from the cities, and the presence of refugees from enemy countries.

As to the Black Market, to get it into proper proportion we need to realise that conditions of war-time stringency always produce Black Market offences and that the Black Market in this country has never assumed the proportions that it has, for example, in Germany, where no Jews are involved; that all the Black Market convictions in this country only touch one in a thousand of the traders in the trades affected; and that as these happen to be trades in which numerically many Jews are involved, one would expect a considerable proportion of Jewish names among the convictions. It is on this factual basis that the question needs to be considered, but that is not all. People often speak as though

Jewish Black Market offenders were the only offenders against the war effort. In actual fact, so far as the war effort is concerned all the Black Market offences put together do not create such danger as the crimes and scandals which have occurred in munitions works — the Liverpool scandals, the making of profits of 80 per cent. on warships and so on — and so far not a single Jewish name has occurred in any of these records. Undoubtedly there are Jewish offenders in the Black Market. But who is to cast the first stone? The complaint is often made that it would be more tolerable if the Jews would admit it and do something about it. Both these complaints are untrue. The Jews have never denied it, and the Anglo-Jewish Community has officially established a Trades Advisory Council[1] which will patiently, and at its own expense, examine any complaint made to it of Jewish commercial behaviour which causes distress or indignation to any member of the non-Jewish community. But the antisemite prefers that complaints circulate unverified and unexamined in the dark, that they pass from gossip to gossip, growing as they pass.

Evacuation was also a fruitful field for anti-Jewish stories. In actual fact the problem of the villagers (and I speak as a billeting officer) was 'the Londoners' generally; and it was only in the process of time that other 'Londoners' were forgotten, and all stories of their misdeeds concentrated on Jewish Londoners. It was of course true that the problem of dealing with the Londoners increased in proportion as the ways of the Londoners were foreign to the villagers, and it was natural that Londoners who were, even by the London standpoint, foreign in some of their domestic habits, should be still more difficult to assimilate. It was sometimes true that the Jewish element among the evacuees was the most conspicuous, but only at a time of hypersensitivity could this be elevated into a 'problem' deserving of national consideration by a people at war for their lives. It was a situation to be sorry about, to try to deal with locally by patience and sympathy — and to forget. It is as a matter of fact one of the most infuriating things for anyone dealing with the Jewish question that insignificant trifles have constantly to be examined, discussed, explained away in a general atmosphere of suspicion as though no one but Jews ever committed any misdeeds of any kind, as though no Jew was ever entitled to be less than perfect, as though one was always trying to 'cover up' something. The obvious answer should be 'Allright. So what?' But so Jew-conscious has Hitler made the whole world that it is usually the most dangerous answer to give.

[1] Its address is Woburn House, Upper Woburn Place, W.C.1.

What is true of evacuation is also true of the position of refugees, and stock stories of the one are frequently told of the other. The famous Jewish lady who stepped out of her place in the fish queue, spat on a large and fine turbot, and then seized it to slap the face of the Gentile lady who protested, has apparently visited every fish shop in England. The story is solemnly repeated all over the country — with as much foundation as the famous Russian passage through England in the last war. It is naturally true that it was often possible for refugees to take early places in queues at a time when the government would not allow them to undertake any work, war work or other. But the stories of their queuing still survive when in most cases it has ceased to have any possible foundation in fact.

Actually there are in England to-day a mass of unresolved problems of adjustment between 'natives' and 'foreigners.' They are all of approximately the same kind, and arise out of the friction caused, not by great matters, but by interruptions of accepted routines. In some cases the foreigners are Poles, in some Americans, and in some Jews. The only point that distinguishes the Jews from others of this category is not that there is any malicious intention in the problems they create, but that in many cases they are likely to last longer. They will last, though in a few localities only, until there is that formal assimilation of external manners of daily life which makes for ease and smooths away personal differences. And the problem will last longer than it need so long as widespread anti-Jewish feeling both separates them from their neighbours and forces them to draw together for social life. But the fact that it lasts longer than other problems of 'foreigners' only introduces it into another general category of problems. It does not make it unique. It is absurd to speak as though the only time anyone suddenly found an unpleasant alteration in the tranquil routine of daily life occurred when a district became popular with Jews. It happens when a village outside a big town becomes turned into a housing estate; when an aerodrome is built near a quiet spot; when a favourite country or seaside retreat is 'discovered' by motor-'buses and trippers, and so on and so on. It is just as irritating, but nobody suggests it is due to malice, that it presents a grave national problem, or that there must be a sinister plot in it somewhere. Yet reasonable people will assume all those things if the cause of the change is Jewish. Again it is a tribute to the success of Hitler who has made the whole world Jew-conscious.

But it must also be recognized that, on this subject at any rate, Hitler has his followers and agents here. An excellent example was the way in which the shelter disaster, which had nothing whatever to do with Jews, was immediately exploited in a whispering

campaign to arouse anti-Jewish feeling. To the very credulous it was announced as a deliberate Jewish plot; to the more ordinary it was said to be due to Jewish cowardice, Jewish panic, Jewish selfishness, Jewish anything you like, but of course, *Jewish*. Many 18b's who were prominent in the British Union of Fascists have now been released. Activities in the East End are beginning again; slogans are appearing on walls; there is a society which transforms itself with the facility of Paupakeewis, now appearing as the British Protestant League, now as the British National Party, but always circulating the same stories about the Jews, the same quotations and misquotations, that their predecessors drew from the inexhaustible supplies of Erfurt, Hamburg and Berlin. These societies, with their little publications, their whispering campaigns, their access to the forces in pubs and canteens, are doing all they can to create the kind of atmosphere which will undermine unity, confuse issues, and allow a comeback to all the anti-democratic forces at an appropriate opportunity.

But it has to be admitted that all the anti-Jewish feeling in the country is not due to war conditions. There were a number of social frictions before the war. There was no Jewish problem in the sense in which there was a real Jewish problem in Poland; there was none of what Jabotinsky brilliantly called 'the anti-semitism of facts.' For the stories that Jews dominated to our national disadvantage this or that aspect of British life were one and all absurd. The feeling that existed was vaguer, but nevertheless real. It arose out of dislike of 'Jewish commercial practices.' 'Jewish social behaviour,' 'Jewish ostentation,' and so on. Allowing for the fact that every community, even the Jewish, must be allowed to contain some unsatisfactory individuals, these complaints, economic as well as social, were nearly always complaints against the less assimilated section of the community, against those whose Russian background was very close, both in Russia and in the East End of London (for after their arrival in England Russian Jews had huddled together for social life, for economy, and for mutual protection against a foreign seeming and often hostile world). It was not against the older sections of the community.

In relation to these Jews the question is often asked why the Jewish community does not itself attempt to exercise some discipline over them. They bring the whole of Jewry into disrepute, it is argued, but the Jews do nothing about it. This statement is made widely and made in good faith; but it is, all the same, unjustified. The Jewish community does all that it possibly can, but it has no legal powers over those whom the rest of the world chooses to consider Jews. It is not usually known that when these immigrants arrived the community assumed full responsibility for

them. Until the abnormal conditions of this war, Jewish immigrants were never a charge on the public rates. The community undertook to teach them English; it established craft and technical schools for them; it looked after the sick and aged. And all this at its own expense, with no help from Christian or public funds. When any complaint comes before the Jewish Board of Deputies, its committee and officers will examine it with as much care as possible. They will take all the steps they can to convert the offender — but they have no legal power. But, it is said, why do the Synagogue authorities not expel from the Synagogue Jews who cause a scandal. This solution is not so easy as it sounds. Certainly Synagogues seek to exclude from office those whose lives bring the community into disrepute. But apart from the fact that it would lay them open to a rather obvious charge of Pharisaism, it is a little too much to ask them deliberately to provide an eager antisemitic press with the public records of Jewish misdeeds which expulsion from the Synagogue would involve. And by British, not Jewish, law, such an expulsion would almost certainly be defamatory. For it is to be assumed that the offender has committed no crime against British law, since, if he has, it is for the British, not the Jewish authorities to proceed against him. Like the Christian parson, they can do no more than preach, and privately admonish, and this they certainly do. But, like the Christian parson, they find that Jewish offenders are most frequent among the class which pays little attention to religious authority and religious discipline. What authority would the Archbishop of Canterbury himself have to suppress the misdeeds of the turf and the racing stadium?

Whether consciously or unconsciously fostered, there is, then, an enormous amount of exaggeration and misunderstanding about the actual Jewish situation in our midst. The rising feeling at the present time is due to war conditions and to deliberately created antagonisms and suspicions. But two other factors help it to spread.

In the first place we do not recognize *all* Jews nearly as easily as we think we do. It will sometimes be found that in an army unit the behaviour of a single Jewish soldier has created quite a lot of ill-feeling, when there are a dozen or half-a-dozen other Jews with whom the same soldiers are in regular contact, but who had never been thought of as Jewish. The opinion of the unit will certainly be based on the one Jew they dislike, not on the many whom they accept as comrades. The same is true in civil life. There are thousands of Jews in all walks of life who bear English names, who in appearance and habits are indistinguishable from other Englishmen, and who are not taken into account when Mr. Brown

or Mrs. Jones form their estimate of 'Jewish' character and 'Jewish' characteristics. They only begin to think of someone as Jewish when there is some cause of complaint, objection or dislike. When Mr. Errington, or Lieut. Newglass or Dr. Hannah Billig win the George Cross no one hastens to distinguish them as Jews.

This fact has considerable additional importance in war-time. In peace-time we form estimates of our neighbours in accordance with the diverse sets of values which our interests and outlook suggest. One person may well like what another holds in abhorrence. But in war-time we have only one standard: relevance to the war effort. From this point of view it is a major tragedy for the Jews that there is no Jewish army. There are many arguments for and against it on other grounds. But on this ground the force of the argument is undeniable. The facts that no war-correspondent can write from 'the Jewish H.Q., Sicily,' and that no unit of the Air Forces is openly named Jewish, that there are no Jewish warships, entirely falsify the picture of 'the Jews' in the minds of the public. They think of them only in relation to offences against the war-effort, never as partners in it. They do not know that Jews are fighting on all fronts and in all the forces of the United Nations. In most cases they are inevitably there as individuals. One cannot expect to hear of their activities as Jewish; but the consequence is that when they win decorations it does not make Mr. Brown or Mrs. Jones even for a moment revise their opinion of 'the Jews.' Yet if I take the *Jewish Chronicle* for the week in which I am writing (November 3) I find that Sgt. Kendrick and Sgt. Silverman of the R.A.F. have received the D.F.M., Flying-Officer D. H. Coley the D.F.C., while six English Jews have been killed in action and one has died on active service. Two English and twenty Palestinian Jews are among the repatriated prisoners of war. And the Jewish skipper of a Jewish steamer is awarded the M.B.E. (it is the honorary M.B.E. because he is not British but Palestinian). And this week is by no means exceptional.

But apart from these individuals, there have been a number of occasions on which Jews have fought corporately, but we only read of them as Free French, as Palestinian, or as Pioneers. As Free French they were mainly responsible for the defence of Bir Hakeim, as Palestinians they covered our advance into Syria and performed manifold services in Africa, as Pioneers they assisted to cover our tragic retreat from Greece. So long as this silence lasts, and it must be feared that it will now last until the end of hostilities, the public perpetually gets a one-sided picture of Jewish participation in the war.

This is tragic not only because it aids the spread of anti-Jewish feeling at the present time. It is still more tragic in that it gives the Jews a 'bad press' against the time when their needs come to be considered in the post-war settlement. People will see no reason to be generous, for, they will say, the Jews took no share in the fighting.

So far as that settlement is concerned there are three groups to be considered. There is no single solution of the Jewish question, and what would be suitable for the Jews of England might be useless or worse for the Jews of Rumania. The three groups are: the relatively small Jewish populations in western Europe, who had enjoyed complete equality of rights before Hitler overran the continent; the relics of the larger groups in eastern Europe, especially in Poland and Rumania; and the homeless Jews, whose future is bound up with the problem of Palestine and Jewish group re-settlement. As to the first group little is needed except the proper restoration of their previous equality. The other problems which affect them will equally affect thousands of non-Jews who have also been despoiled and subjected to persecution. As to the second group, it is impossible to make intelligent proposals until we know whether we are speaking in terms of millions or of a few thousand. How extensive the massacres have actually been, how many have managed to escape or have been concealed by Christian friends we have as yet no means of judging; but the tragic probability is that it will only be remnants of these once vast Jewish populations which will greet the final entry of the United Nations.

The most important and difficult group is the third, and to it may well have to be added what is left of the second. For there comes a point at which it is intolerable to consider further life in surroundings which recall so many horrors, such bitter memories. There are two alternatives: to search the world for areas allowing group settlement, or to make it possible for the maximum possible number to go to Palestine and, if Palestine proves inadequate to hold all, to allow the rest to have some strong spiritual and cultural link with the National Home.

It is the future of Palestine which is the central issue, but that is too intricate a problem to be solved here.

From a Christian point of view, however, the Jewish problem is not merely social and political. There is a big underlying religious issue which must ultimately be faced. Whatever may be the intention of religious teachers, whether in the pulpit or the Sunday School, however benevolent the outlook of modern missionaries to the Jews, a big revision of our estimates of Judaism is long overdue. We cannot permanently accept a complete contradiction between the study and the lectern, and we have ultimately either

to admit that all discoveries of modern scholarship in this field are false or take some action against the consistent misrepresentation of Judaism which uncommented and unexpurgated reading of the New Testament is bound to produce in any ordinary congregation. We cannot permanently ignore the work of Moore, Branscomb, Herford, Montefiore and Abrahams. Either they were mistaken, or the New Testament view is prejudiced and unfair and must be officially abandoned. The link between this and the political aspect of the problem is obvious, for no one can pretend that a bald presentation of the New Testament story will tend to make people love the Jews. Of course there are some teachers who can dress it in such a way as to alter its natural effects, but we cannot forget that the Churches are heavily implicated in the antisemitic movement throughout the world, and have relied on the Bible evidence to add fuel to their fire.

It is no good pretending that the problem is not exceedingly difficult and that the very idea of 'tampering with the new Testament' is repulsive to most Christians. But let us at least face the alternative, which is the consistent misrepresentation of the religion of Jesus Himself. Jesus was a loyal Jew. The sermon on the mount is a Jewish utterance. The Lord's Prayer is a Jewish prayer. Paul was to the end of his life a Pharisee. If this were all said explicitly in the New Testament, then it would do no harm that the errors of Judaism, the failures of Jews, were castigated as severely as they might deserve. But it is not said. The New Testament is not popularly understood in that sense. Recently I saw two religious education films on the Life of Jesus and the Life of Paul. The makers of both must have combed the ghettoes of London or New York for the hostile crowds, the enemies of the apostles or of Jesus. They were the most exaggerated 'Jewish' types — and the most repellent. But Paul and the apostles were the most elegant middle-class Aryans imaginable. Even their voices were different. In the study we can admit — indeed we cannot help it — that the Gospels were written during a period of increasing controversy with the Jewish leaders, and reflect the bitterness of that controversy. In the study we may — indeed must — redress the balance of the attacks of the Pauline letters on the Law by references to the Acts of the Apostles, and to our knowledge of contemporary Judaism. We are failing in our duties as stewards of the Gospel until we begin to consider what is to be done in public. 'The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life' can apply to the text of the New Testament as well as to anything else.

Once we face this issue we must go on to face the issue of the missions to the Jews. It is not a question of denying the right of

any individual Jew to accept Jesus as Messiah, or of any individual Christian trying to persuade him to do so. It is a question of the official attitude of the Christian Church to the Jewish Synagogue. That the past record of Christian Missions to the Jews is appalling is historically undeniable, for a Mission to the Jews has been in existence for nearly 1,900 years, and includes every horror of massacre, persecution, legal discrimination, distortion, and victimisation in its records. It is convenient of course to forget this; but the Jews do not, and Christian historians should not. Modern missions cannot be conveniently separated from this background. The record of the missions is not only disastrous, but contains unique features, features which should give us furiously to think whether the missionary approach can really be the right one. In the record of our relations with other religions there is nothing in the least parallel to our record in relation to the Jews. Its pages are blotted not once, but in every century down to the twentieth with a series of 'converted' Jews who have proved their 'conversion' by the bestiality of the false accusations which they have launched against their late co-religionists.

A converted Jew invented the accusation that the Jews committed ritual murder.[2]

A converted Jew invented the accusation that the Jews were in league with the lepers to poison the wells, and so caused the Black Death.[3]

A converted Jew invented the story that an orthodox Jew required a drop of Christian blood every day.[4]

A converted Jew invented the story that there was a secret Jewish world government plotting the destruction of Christendom.[5]

Each in his own time was proved to be a liar, but not by the Churches, nor is there any record of the Churches taking action against them.

To this we have to add *in our own day* the horrible record of certain missions to the Jews, which have never been officially denounced by the Churches, and which have used the distress of Jewish parents in Germany and Czechoslovakia to get possession of their children and bring them up in the 'Christian' faith.

[2] A monk of Cambridge at the enquiry in the death of William of Norwich in the twelfth century, repeated by Paulus Meyer, a convert of the nineteenth century.

[3] A converted Jew of Anjou at the beginning of the fourteenth century.

[4] A 'rabbi' quoted by Gougmot des Mousseaux in *Les Juifs, le Judaism et la Judaisation des peoples chrêtiens.*

[5] Brafman, a Russian convert.

Can an approach which has led to such results, not once nor twice, but in century after century, really be the right approach? I believe that a wholly new approach is required, one which is made *ex aequo*, and which recognizes that in our Gentile tradition there are essential elements of the Jewish faith of Jesus and of Paul which we have missed, and which rabbinic Judaism has retained. It is not a question of denying that we possess truth; it is a question of admitting — and in the study most of us would admit it — that in our historic tradition we do not possess the whole truth, and that some of the parts we lack are to be found in Judaism. Because of these lacks the Jew has never been at home in the civilization now dying; and this is the reverse of the picture discussed in the earlier pages of this article. For he who is not at home is restless and ill at ease. He is inevitably 'difficult.' And so problems arise. If the citizen, the sociologist, the teacher have much work to do before the Jewish problem ceases to be one which haunts the peace of the peoples, the ultimate problem rests with the Christian and his attitude not only to the Jew but to the religious tradition which he embodies.

HUBERT HANDLEY

(1854 — 1943)

HUBERT HANDLEY, who passed away on the 14th of October, was a distinguished clergyman of the Church of England, although he never occupied any more exalted ecclesiastical post than that of Vicar in a working-class parish of the Metropolis.

Born in Warwick, a member of a devout Church family — his father an Evangelical, his mother a zealous Tractarian 'who knew almost all Keble's *Christian Year* by heart' — he learnt to love the National Church with a deep and understanding love and with an ardour which never cooled during his long life. A graduate of Lincoln College, Oxford, in the days when the notable Mark Pattison was Rector, Handley was ordained for work in the London Diocese. He served in a number of metropolitan curacies, the last being that of St. James', Piccadilly. In 1894 he was presented by Mr. Gladstone to the Vicarage of St. Thomas', Camden Town. Here he laboured with conspicuous success as a parochial clergyman. He was a moving preacher. He had a clear, manly, well-modulated voice and always spoke King's English. Clerical jargon, pious cant and theological technicalities he abhorred. He

made his church the spiritual and social home of a large working-class congregation. Some account of the development of the institutional and social life of his parish is given in his remarkable volume, *Theological Room*, in the chapter entitled 'Parochial Ideals.' He retired in 1914, after twenty years' service as Vicar.

The most remarkable feature of Hubert Handley's clerical life was the way in which as a hard-working parish priest, immersed in manifold parochial duties, he yet found time and energy to concentrate on the larger problems and policies of the National Church. His interest in and service for the extra-parochial Church world was inspired and directed by intensely practical motives. If the English Church was to be effective in the parochial sphere, it was of primary importance that it should become effective in its national organization and policy. The parochial and the national could not be kept in water-tight compartments. It was such convictions as these which led Hubert Handley in 1901 to publish his *Fatal Opulence of Bishops*—a title worthy of Tacitus. In this volume, regardless of his ecclesiastical prospects he bravely attacked the large incomes of the bishops and the dignified state in which they lived. He did this because he discovered that episcopal opulence was an offence to the labouring classes and led to their separation from the Church. Had the labouring classes been able to realize that the English bishops lead very simple, hard-working lives, and that their incomes are spent almost entirely in the service of their dioceses and wider Church activities, and certainly not in self-indulgent pleasure and leisure, they would have felt no resentment at episcopal opulence. Handley's criticism of episcopal opulence inspired his diocesan to publish his accounts, and led to the bishop being publicly criticized for spending so small a sum annually on his library. To-day, when the bishops have the greatest difficulty in paying their income-tax and rates, and as a consequence are most anxious to surrender their palaces and castles and to live in suburban villas, *The Fatal Opulence of Bishops* has lost its *raison d'être*.

In 1906 a more important work appeared from Handley's pen, *A Declaration on Biblical Criticism*. Biblical criticism, which had become known to the British public many years earlier by Bishop Colenzo's work on the historical character of the Pentateuch, later by the publication of *Essays and Reviews*, and later still by the appearance of *Lux Mundi*, was nevertheless viewed askance by many of the clergy when applied to the New Testament. Handley hoped to commend and promote critical study of the New Testament by eliciting from the clergy of the Anglican Communion a definite expression in favour of such study. This task was a heavy one, but he had the assistance of a committee and he succeeded in

securing 1,725 weighty clerical signatures to a document which contained, among others, the following declaration :

> 'Our desire that, as many of the clergy have already, with advantage to Christian faith and with a general assent on the part of their rulers, welcomed important results of a patient, reverent, and progressive criticism of the Old Testament, so the clergy, as Christian teachers, may now receive authoritative encouragement to face the critical problems of the New Testament with entire candour, reverence for God and His truth, and loyalty to the Church of Christ.'

The *Declaration on Biblical Criticism* was widely welcomed by the Press at home and overseas, although the bishops at home 'outwardly maintained a general silence.'

In 1908 he edited and contributed to *Anglican Liberalism*. The other contributors were Sir Thomas Dyke Acland, Prof. Burkitt, Prof. Caldecott, Dr. A. J. Carlyle, Prof. Percy Gardner, Canon Lilley, Dr. W. D. Morrison, Dr. Hastings Rashdall, Rev. C. R. Shaw Stewart, Rev. J. R. Wilkinson, Dr. H. G. Woods (Master of the Temple)—all members of the Modern Churchmen's Union. Handley's essay on 'Religious Liberalism' pleaded for reformation of the English Church on lines which were loyal to her spirit of Truth, Freedom and Comprehensiveness and to her policy of maintaining historic continuity.

> 'Through the English Church our religion can *grow*; here is the line of life; here is organic process; here is what the past unfolded; here lies evolutionary expectation. "In what we improve we are never wholly new; in what we retain, we are never wholly obsolete" (Edmund Burke). We believe that the English Church may still suffice. Only the English Church must be reformed.'

In 1914 he published *Theological Room*, which was undoubtedly the most representative expression of his convictions and ideals. It consisted of 'Gathered Papers.' On its title-page was a significant citation from the modernist Jesuit, George Tyrrell :

> 'The position I have come to these last years is . . . one which an Anglican can hold *honestly*, but which a Romanist holds only by an equivocation. Any other sect ties you to a spot — Anglicanism gives you a wide range.'

Theological Room is so full of good things that it is difficult to know what to select for citation. Here is a letter from Mark Pattison, to whom Handley had written for advice about subscription as a condition of ordination.

> Lincoln College, Oxford.
>
> DEAR HANDLEY, *24th Feb.* 1876.
>
> The question you put to me is one which it is not possible to answer satisfactorily by letter. It requires many words, and a mutual understanding upon preliminary points, which can only be carried out in conversation.

I can only say on this sheet of paper, that there are two fixed principles, which I should lay down, within which the argument must move.

1. A man must not put his hand to what he thinks untrue..

2. In joining any large association, general consent is all that can be expected.

These two positions are, I think, the opposite poles between which a man has to find his own standing ground. Probably no two men stand on exactly the same square inch of ground.

Are you likely to be in Oxford soon? If so, I should be glad to talk the matter over with you. But you see that it is far beyond the limits of a letter.

Yours very truly,

MARK PATTISON.

Theological Room contains a wistful plea addressed in 1903 to the Dean and Canons of Westminster that they should give as much support as they dare to liturgical liberalism and doctrinal liberalism in the Abbey services. More interesting still is 'A Proposed Petition to King Edward VII against Luxury' (27th Oct., 1908). This was preceded by 'King Edward VII and a Simpler National Life,' an article published in *The Guardian* 23rd Jan., 1907. This article the author respectfully forwarded with a letter to the Sovereign on the day of its publication. It was acknowledged, but without thanks.

Liberal Churchmen will find two notable documents republished in this volume—'Two Petitions for Freedom'—one from the Modern Churchmen's Union, the other from thirty-six eminent Churchmen. These petitions, which were cordially welcomed by Archbishop Davidson in Convocation on 28th April, 1914, ultimately prepared the way for the *Doctrinal Report* of 1938.

Belonging to the same period is the paper 'Ought there to be a Broad Church Disruption?' (published in the *Hibbert Journal*, January, 1914). Of course Handley was against disruption and saw that the true remedy for the theological crisis in the English Church was fearless truth-speaking on the part of the clergy combined with a readiness to welcome all the assured results of scientific and historical research and the basing of the claims of the Christian Religion upon its moral and spiritual truth.

'. . . To rear the Christian edifice on territory which we rent from the historians, and from which they may oust us, rather than on the native spiritual ground and indefeasible freehold of the Church, this would be again to play the obscurantist and disastrous part of the Roman Church in Spain, of the Eastern Church in Russia.'

Perhaps even more significant is Handley's claim that the liberal clergy cannot and ought not to be satisfied with being merely tolerated by the Church authorities. They must be welcomed by

them even as the captain of a ship about to navigate a dangerous harbour welcomes the pilot.

> 'And for us the Liberal Clergy, too, recognition will not suffice; our principles are not to be tolerated, they are to prevail. . . . We claim not sufferance, but control; we will have from the conservatives no condescension; we are not permitted, we are essential; the need of us now, moreover, is surpassing; . . . inchoately, in hidden potentiality and slow genesis, we even *are* the future Church. . . .'

After 1914 he used the *Modern Churchman* as the main vehicle of his message to his fellow-Churchmen and contributed to it a number of extremely interesting articles, reviews and letters.

Hubert Handley gained much and gave much by his membership of religious societies. He was a member of the Modern Churchmen's Union for over forty years. He sat on its Council in those early days when it used to meet in the vestry of Bow Church under the leadership of the Rev. A. W. Hutton, who himself in his Roman Catholic days had lived with Cardinal Newman at Edgbaston. Handley was a member of the C.C.C.—a clerical club founded by F. D. Maurice—a rallying centre for the liberal minded clergy of the metropolis. He was also a member of the London Society for the Study of Religion. The two most eminent members of this distinguished society were Baron Friedrich Von Hügel and Dr. C. G. Montefiore, for both of whom Handley had the highest admiration and warmest affection. He also belonged to The Quiet XII. This 'secret' society—'a brotherhood of clergy bound together in prayer for the Modern Movement in the Church of England'—was perhaps the most significant of the societies to which he belonged. The card of The Quiet XII was characterized by two symbols: at its head the Cross, at its foot the Praying Hands of Albrecht Dürer. Among the members of The Quiet XII were many of Handley's most intimate friends—C. R. Shaw Stewart, C. J. Sharp, Fergus Wood, J. R. Wilkinson, H. B. Chapman (of the Savoy Chapel), James Granville Adderley, R. B. Tollinton and Alfred Caldecott.

Years ago, when visiting Ripon Hall, Handley asked the Principal to place in the Vestry of the Chapel a little card. It was inscribed with three words, 'Mighty to Save.' These words are the key to the understanding of Handley's religion and life. The Christian Religion was for him dominantly not a soporific but a dynamic—a saving power—and all that professed to be the Christian Religion he tested by its ability to save from selfish individualism, from obscurantism, from cowardice and from every kind of insincerity and hardness. Deeply reverent, he detested formalism and artificiality and an un-English ceremonialism in public worship. 'If,' said he, 'our bishops knew when they wear

mitres what fools they look in the eyes of working people, I am sure they would never wear them.' Everything which thwarted the saving power of the Christian Religion he opposed intensely, whether callous complacency, smug obscurantism, opulent self-indulgence, or ecclesiastical exclusiveness. These things he detested primarily because they sterilized Christianity. Christ's saving power, he was convinced, must first be realized in the personal life of the pastor. Prayer in the form of constant dependence upon God for spiritual enlightenment and moral strength was the foundation of saving power in the individual. His ideal of salvation was the realization, maintenance and development of 'sane relations with the Eternal.'

His test for every Church institution and practice was its power to save. Some things judged by this test are useless; other things were worse than useless: all such ought to be unflinchingly and uncompromisingly rejected. Yet he was no 'iconoclast.' He venerated with devoted loyalty so much that is truly beautiful and inexpressibly precious in the Church of England—her English Scriptures, her Prayer Book, her parish churches and cathedrals, her inspiring music, her sacred learning, and not least the noble simplicity, love of truth, freedom, generosity, kindness which characterized her laity whether gentle or simple. Handley's test of 'Mighty to Save' he applied fearlessly to all our national institutions. A Christian nation must be judged, reformed, developed in accordance with the saving power of Christ's Religion. No sphere of national life might be exempted.

Most appropriately, his funeral took place on St. Luke's Day; for Handley, like St. Luke, was a physician of the soul and knew well how to administer to sick souls the 'wholesome medicines' of the Gospel of Christ. His own personality in its goodness and attractiveness and in his readiness to suffer for others was, for those who knew him, a constant witness to the saving power of Christ's 'wholesome medicines.'

H.D.A.M.

THE APOSTOLIC GOSPEL*

By the Rev. V. J. K. Brook, Fellow of All Souls' and Censor of St. Catherine's Society.

'When they therefore were come together, they asked him, saying, Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel? And he said unto them, It is not for you to know the times or the seasons which the Father hath put in his own power. But ye shall receive power after that the holy Ghost is come upon you.' — Acts i, 6-8.

THE disciples were in a hurry, for they were human. Now at last, they hoped, after the death and resurrection, triumph was to begin, the Kingdom of God to be set up in power beyond challenge. The answer of Jesus is significant. '*It is not for you to know times or seasons, . . . but ye shall receive power.*' The setting up of the Kingdom was God's business: they were not to fix their their attention too much on that. Their concern was to be witnesses from Jerusalem in an expanding circle unto the uttermost parts of the earth. For that, their task, they would be clothed with power. But even in that work they were not to be in too great a hurry. '*He commanded them that they should not depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the Father which, saith he, ye have heard of me.*' They were not to begin before they were fully equipped, and their message rounded off and complete. And part of that message was to be the new power which God had given to men in His Spirit.

Thus the gift of the Spirit was not a mere appendix to the Gospel, but was essential to it. It is therefore surprising that there is no single version of its bestowal of which one can say with certainty that it is the primitive, official account of what took place, guaranteed by the unanimous voice of Christian tradition. Besides the familiar story of Pentecost, with the appearance of tongues parting asunder like as of fire and sitting upon each one of them, there is also Acts iv, 31: '*And when they had prayed, the place was shaken where they were assembled together, and they were all filled with the holy Ghost and they spake the word of God with boldness.*' The details there are less striking; the occasion is different: it comes after the release of Peter and John from prison. It is not, of course, certain that this is to be regarded as an alternative account of the giving of the Spirit. But it does seem not unlikely; for careful analysis of the early chapters of Acts makes it almost certain that here, as in the Gospel, Luke was com-

* Sermon preached in Somerville College Chapel, Oxford, at the Modern Churchmen's Conference, on July 28, 1943.

bining different sources which sometimes did not completely agree. Moreover, it is possible that we have even a third account in what has long been known as the 'spiritual' gospel. In St. John we read that when Jesus appeared to the disciples in the Upper Room, seemingly on Easter day itself, '*he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the holy Ghost: whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained.*'

It would therefore seem that, even in *very* early days, there were different accounts of how the Spirit was given. If so, for better or for worse, it only means that that event is on a par with other happenings after the Resurrection. The difficulty of exactly locating the appearances of Christ is well known. In St. Matthew they are in Gallilee; so they were, on the ordinary view, in the lost ending of St. Mark. In St. Luke, on the other hand, they are in Jerusalem or its neighbourhood. The Fourth Gospel puts the earlier appearances in Jerusalem, the later ones in Gallilee.

In regard to the Ascension there are like difficulties. In Acts it is plainly suggested that it took place visibly forty days after Easter. But from St. Luke's Gospel — the only Gospel which includes an account of the Ascension, and even there the reading is uncertain—the natural impression is that the Ascension took place immediately after Jesus had appeared to the disciples in the Upper Room and led them forth to Bethany. Once again the Fourth Gospel implies a different view. In the garden, Mary is bidden '*Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended*'; a week later, Thomas is urged to feel the print of the nails. The clear impression is that Jesus meanwhile had 'ascended'—whatever that word meant for the writer of the Fourth Gospel. Certainly he has no account of it as a visible event.

Such confusion may seem at first to offer firm ground for disbelief. But fuller consideration of the early traditions does not in fact justify such an attitude. There are quite plainly two versions of the death of Judas Iscariot — that he hanged himself, or that he fell headlong and burst asunder, seemingly in the very field which he had purchased with the reward of iniquity. There have not been wanting commentators to reconcile the two accounts by the suggestion that the rope with which he hanged himself broke, and so he fell. Less ingenious minds will, I think, prefer to suppose that the two accounts are really divergent, and that early Christians were not concerned to reconcile them because details did not matter in view of the central fact, of which they were sure, that the traitor perished miserably. Even more striking are the three accounts in the Acts of the Conversion of St. Paul, each differing a little from the others. But he would be indeed a bold critic who,

on that basis, set himself to maintain that St. Paul was not converted on the Damascus road. On the contrary, to St. Luke the certainty of that, the really important thing, was such that he felt no need to iron out discrepancies and produce a single consistent and, as it were, stock account.

So it was, as it seems to me, in other and greater matters—the appearances of Christ, the Ascension, the gift of the Spirit. To the writers of the New Testament, the central fact was in each case so far beyond all question or challenge that mere differences of detail were insignificant. Their survival, in fact, really serves to underline the security and confidence of the main conviction. Had it been otherwise, indeed, I do not for a moment doubt that clever critics would have found grave reasons for suspicion. If the evidence had come to us tabulated, regimented, neatly arranged, that would have suggested at once that it had been, so to speak, doctored in order to bolster up a faith which could not stand without artificial support.

For, consider the position. Early Christians did not expect or need a single continuous, coherent and complete account of the Resurrection appearances. It was quite enough for them to know that Christ had really been seen by Peter here, by John there, by Cleopas on the road to Emmaus, and so on. A few well-known instances were quite enough to prove the case. That is all we should expect in their situation, and all that was in fact aimed at. No account at all has survived of what was probably the first and most interesting appearance of all — that to Simon Peter. In St. Paul's list in I Corinthians it is mentioned first, St. Mark's Gospel seems to be leading up to it, and it is referred to in St. Luke: but we have no account of it. So far is the New Testament from giving a complete record. The main fact of the Resurrection was so firmly believed that only a rather haphazard selection of the appearances has survived.

The variations in the accounts of the Ascension and the gift of the Spirit are similarly explicable. The period during which Christ showed himself from time to time to the disciples '*by many infallible proofs*' came to an end. The disciples were sure—largely because of the outpouring of the Spirit — that he had returned to the Father who had sent him. That was what they meant by the Ascension, and in comparison with that the details of how it came about were comparatively unimportant. Thereafter the guidance and strength of his visible presence were no longer available: but their place was taken by the power and wisdom of Christ within, or of the Holy Spirit of the Spirit of Christ — for the terminology of those early days is not precise, and the new power in themselves of which they were certain is described in all those ways. But once

again, the details of how and when exactly it came were of slight significance to them compared with the overwhelming fact of which they were sure—that it had come. Only if there had been doubts in their minds should we have expected any careful editing and re-arrangement of the details into a tidy pattern such as those who have not their experience incline to demand.

All that, and no less than that, was the gospel they believed themselves commissioned to preach; not only the life and teaching of Jesus and his death on the Cross, but also his resurrection and ascension, the coming of the Holy Spirit and the expectation of the kingdom of God. But that last point, if we are to trust the hint given in the words of my text, was for the future and for God. It was to be expected with confidence, but they were not to know when nor to give too much attention to it. And sure enough, after the excitement of the first few decades, the thought of it does become much less prominent. In the later letters of St. Paul, as contrasted with the earlier, it is on the periphery rather than in the centre of interest. In the Fourth Gospel the expectation of a visible return of Christ in glory has almost disappeared. It lingered on indeed till the end of the second century; but Eusebius already regards Papias as a man of mean intellect because of his millenarian views! For the truth is that though the hope of a divine consummation, the firm belief that ultimately God will realise his purposes, must always be a part of any true Christian faith, yet the gospel of the early Church did not rightly depend or centre on it. When they were endued with the Spirit, said Jesus, they were to be witnesses. The gift of the Spirit, not the arrival of the kingdom, marked the rounding off and perfecting of the good news they were to spread.

The insistence of Jesus that the disciples should not start their mission before their message was thus completed is, as I have said, significant. Not only does it show his loving concern that the disciples should not set out ill-equipped and with a partial message, but it is a warning for all generations against the danger of presenting an incomplete or one-sided version of what is in fact a complex but coherent body of teaching. To fix the eye exclusively on a single feature of the whole will throw the rest out of focus. The easy possibility of that may be illustrated even from some of the writings of the New Testament if they are isolated from their context. The saying of St. Paul, for example, that '*If I have known Christ after the flesh, yet now know I him so no longer*,' seems almost to sweep aside as unimportant the earthly Christ and to concentrate on the heavenly, and so to end in Christo-centric mysticism. The writer to the Hebrews again appears to be predominantly concerned with the heavenly high-priesthood of the

glorified Christ. Some later Christians, as it seems to me, by isolating such partial teaching and treating it as alone central, have presented a very one-sided and incomplete Christianity—a result for which neither St. Paul nor the writer to the Hebrews, if they are fairly treated, can justly be held accountable. The latter, for example, lays more stress on the reality and significance of the earthly life than almost any other New Testament writing outside the Synoptic Gospels. St. Paul also, by a word here and a hint there, makes it abundantly clear that he had a close and accurate knowledge of the teaching and character of the Jesus of history. Moreover it was St. Luke, who presumably had learned his Christianity from St. Paul, who set himself to write out accurately and in order the life of Christ, and produced the Gospel in which perhaps above all others the human appeal of that life is displayed. He at least had not learned from St. Paul to regard Christ according to the flesh as of no account. It would be not only paradoxical but unjust to maintain that St. Paul preached a truncated gospel, or that the writer to the Hebrews undervalued the earthly life of Christ. It is not fair to isolate a particular writing addressed to a special group in circumstances which may have been peculiar and treat it as though it alone contained the whole Christian message.

A truer view of that, it seems to me, is to be had from such a document as the First Epistle of St. Peter, all the more balanced and complete because it was a general epistle and therefore not composed to meet the special needs of some particular church. Moreover, though its authorship has been questioned, there is in fact very strong reason to believe that it really was written by St. Peter, and is therefore almost the only book in the New Testament which can claim to be the work of one of the original Twelve, a man who had companied with the Lord in the days of the flesh and lived on to spread the good news. What has such a one to tell us of the '*living hope*,' as he calls it, of '*the inheritance incorruptible and undefiled and that fadeth not away*'? First of all, and very clear throughout, is the controlling memory of Jesus as he had known him. The writer claims to have been a '*witness of the sufferings of Christ*.' When he says that Christians have been begotten again '*unto a living hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead*' we surely have, in that violent metaphor, not the cool statement by a Christian of the second generation of the theological significance of the resurrection, but the vivid memory of one who had shared the desolation and despair of Good Friday and experienced the glad amazement of Easter-day. It is the recollection of Jesus in his trial and suffering which inspires the advice on Christian living: '*Be subject to every ordinance of man*,' as he was at his trial; '*if when ye do well and suffer for it ye take*

it patiently, this is acceptable'—that is what he did; '*not rendering evil for evil, or reviling for reviling.*'

Yet there is also a vivid assurance of the glory and the power of the ascended Lord. '*If ye have tasted that the Lord is gracious: unto whom coming, a living stone . . . ye also as living stones are built up a spiritual house*'; '*that in all things God may be glorified through Jesus Christ, whose is the glory and the dominion for ever and ever.*' For he is '*on the right hand of God, having gone into heaven, angels and authorities and powers being made subject unto him.*'

In this short letter there is the balanced, quiet statement of the whole gospel which the early Church felt itself commissioned to preach. The gracious life and example of Christ on earth, the sacrifice on the Cross (to which there are three full references), the joy of the resurrection, the present glory in heaven, the strength and guidance he gives to those who will have them, the certainty of a divine consummation—all are there, each in due portion playing its part in the full Christian message. That is what Christianity meant to a writer who was, as I believe, the leader of the apostles.

Church history is full of the records of enthusiastic Christian teachers whose message has failed to win permanent hearing largely because, unlike that of St. Peter, it has been one-sided and incomplete. A part—a real part—of the gospel has been so much magnified in isolation that the perfect wholeness of the message has been lost to sight—and nothing less than the whole, it would seem, can permanently satisfy the needs of men. Already, even during the years in which some of the books now in the New Testament were still being written, the gnostic movement seems to have been taking shape—that odd perversion which so stressed the idea of Christianity as the true knowledge that the primitive gospel was transformed into a kind of esoteric puritanism. For a time, especially in Egypt, it had some vogue, but then it declined into a sort of disreputable chicanery: it was inadequate because it was so one-sided. Not long afterwards, Montanism claimed for its members such present plenary inspiration by the Holy Ghost as to make the historic life and death of Christ of little significance. It, too, after the sort of success which almost any real enthusiasm, however unbalanced, can command, especially at such a time as that of the Antonine outlawry of Christianity, faded away into a small and dishonoured sect. But such danger of one-sidedness did not vanish with the primitive Church. In the Middle Ages among some, though not of course all, of the mystics an over-concern with the glorified Christ led to a quietism and indifference to the affairs of every-day life which was barren of practical fruit

and, surely, unfaithful to the example of the Lord. On the other hand, in years nearer to our own, there has been a disposition among some to find the whole value of Christianity in the moral teaching of Christ, quietly dropping out of sight and ignoring, if not actually trying to explain away and deny, whatever in the Gospels or Epistles will not square with the crudest rationalism. The result has been the Jesus of extreme Liberal Protestantism—a figure, beyond question, of noble appeal whose calling is high. And yet it can hardly be denied that even that presentation of the gospel, despite its splendid idealism and freedom from any feature which could shock even the commonest of sense, has yet failed to win the permanent allegiance of the majority or to satisfy their needs.

If we are not too proud to learn from history, its lesson is surely plain enough. The Christian gospel really stands or falls as a whole, and no one part of it can satisfactorily be substituted for that whole. That does not necessarily mean that we are bound to the literal acceptance of each single detail in the New Testament. The mere fact of the divergent traditions which, as I have tried to suggest, actually exist in the New Testament itself shows the impossibility of that. But the essence of the teaching is clear enough. It is that which is really significant, and it can surely be preserved without committing ourselves to a particular view of what exactly constituted what we call the Ascension, or what if any outward signs marked the giving of the Spirit. But, as it seems to me, the gospel is bereft of what is vital and essential unless it enshrines the belief not only in the teaching of Jesus but also that the Cross was not the end; that still he lives, to be worshipped as well as obeyed, ready and able to help those who ask.

All that may, I am well aware, seem to be so orthodox as to be trite and commonplace. Even if true it may be thought dull. And yet I sometimes wonder which of us can face with equanimity the challenge of the failures in Christianity which history presents. For still we are drawn in different ways—one of us, it may be, to the mystic search, another to the Sermon on the Mount, a third to the puzzles of atonement doctrine—all of them real parts of Christianity, none of them, alone, the whole. And of English churchmen as a body I suppose it would not be unjust to say that we are true sons of our fathers. The Reformation here was pre-eminently of the head rather than of the heart. In origin it was not a great popular upheaval, but the work, in the first place, of a handful of scholarly men possessed by a passionate zeal for righteousness. Those qualities still persist in Anglicanism; both the eager desire to understand, and the devotion to upright and kindly living, are still its outstanding characteristics. Nor would any

sensible person doubt that they have a vital part to play in any true Christianity. In all reverence it can be said, God help the Christianity which lacks them. But, alone, they are not the whole. By themselves, they may lack the spirit of worship and the sense of dependence which alone can save Christianity from degenerating into a system of the higher thought or a scheme of the nobler life. But Christianity is neither merely a philosophy nor only an ethic. It is a religion; and worship and dependence are essentials of religion. Only if we give their full place to those truths which are commemorated at Ascension-tide and Whitsun can we hope to present in its completeness the gospel which the world so deeply needs, or to show forth its fruit in our own lives.

A NEW SERVICE OF INFANT BAPTISM

By the Editor.

THE Service for the Public Baptism of Infants in the Prayer Book of 1662 is archaic in language, out-of-date in doctrine, intolerably long, and has little practical meaning for modern-minded people whether educated or uneducated. Many clergymen and, we imagine, a far greater number of laymen are conscious of these defects. Over a quarter of a century ago the Modern Churchmen's Union ventured to publish a Revised Service[1] which sought to remedy some of these defects.

The Service for the Public Baptism of Infants in the Deposited Book of 1928 was a step forward in the right direction, but it did not, in the estimation of many, go far enough. That book's failure to secure legislative sanction has providentially given our Church authorities an opportunity to achieve another and more adequate revision of our Baptismal Service for Infants. We note, therefore, with great satisfaction that the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury has appointed a Committee to undertake this task. We certainly stand in urgent need of a Public Service for the Baptism of Infants which is simple, truthful, practical and brief, conjoined with reverence and inspiration. Such a Service would, in these days of liturgical experiment, have as much legal right to be used in our churches as the Baptismal Service of the Deposited Book of 1928.

We cannot ignore the fact that Evangelicals, Anglo-Catholics, and Liberal Churchmen have differed in their doctrine of Infant Baptism. We believe, however, that to-day Liberal Churchmen

[1] This Service was first published in 1916, revised and re-published in 1936, and after further revision re-published in September, 1941.

and Evangelicals are in general agreement in their doctrine of Infant Baptism, and that Anglo-Catholics, if not in full agreement, are yet prepared to make concessions at least in the form of silence and omission. We urge, therefore, that in revising the Baptismal Service of 1662 the following changes should be made :

(1) The omission of all reference to Original Sin, by which is meant the doctrine that guilt is inherited by infants as the result of the Fall brought about by the sin of Adam and Eve and that as a consequence of the Fall 'all men are conceived and born in sin.'

(2) The omission of all reference to the remission of the sins of infants. In the case of Adult Baptism, the remission of sins is a very important part of the Service and the belief in this remission is expressed in the Nicene Creed ; but the remission of sin, whether original or actual, is not operative in the Baptism of Infants. Tertullian objected to Infant Baptism for this very reason, protesting, 'Why does an age which is innocent hasten to the remission of sins?' (*De Baptismo*, 18).

(3) The omission of the legal fiction by which the sponsors take the baptismal vows in the name of the infant brought to baptism. Some Church people doubt the morality of this transaction, others its value. What is needed in the Baptismal Service of Infants is, not vows made in the name of the infant, but promises made by the parents and godparents that they will do their best to secure that the infant presented for baptism shall be brought up as a child of God.

(4) The omission of all explicit statements that the Holy Spirit is actually given to the infant at baptism. In the New Testament, in some cases, the Holy Spirit is given *before* baptism, in other cases *by* and *in* baptism, in other cases *after* baptism, by the laying on of apostolic hands. All these cases of the gift of the Holy Spirit refer to adults. The absence of any declaration that the Holy Spirit is given to the infant in the act of baptism need not preclude prayers being offered for the gift of the Holy Spirit to the infant, provided that in such prayers the time and method of the gift be left undefined, since all Churchmen believe that the gift of the Holy Spirit will be increasingly bestowed with the rational, moral and spiritual development of the infant in the fellowship and nurture of the Church into which baptism admits the infant.

(5) The omission of the terms 'regenerate' and 'born again,' since they are not strictly applicable to the Baptism of Infants. If of unbaptized children our Saviour could say 'Of such is the

Kingdom of God,' and 'Whosoever shall not receive the Kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein,' it must be concluded that it is not the infant who needs to be born again, but the adult. It is one of the defects of our Prayer Book Service (1662) that phrases and ideas which properly belong to Adult Baptism have been transported into the Service for Infant Baptism. These phrases and ideas should not be allowed to intrude into the proposed Revised Service.

We now turn to some more positive aspects of revision. No Revised Service of Baptism would be adequate which failed to declare in a most solemn and authoritative manner:

(1) That the infant to be baptized is a child of God, and that the dedication of his life to God is the prime purpose of the Baptismal Service.

(2) That it is therefore a primary duty of the parents and all who are responsible for the training and education of the infant to bring *him* up as a child of God. To secure this two things are necessary in the Revised Service: (*a*) that the parents and godparents must clearly and solemnly promise to do this; (*b*) that prayer be offered that the parents and godparents may be inspired and strengthened to carry out their duty in this matter.

(2) That the Revised Service should by prayer, declaration, and symbolic action make it clear that Baptism is the sacrament by which the baptized infant is not only dedicated to God, his Divine Father, but is also admitted into and made a member of the Church of God's Son, Jesus Christ.

(4) While strongly advocating the use of the Triune Baptismal formula, we desire that the Revised Baptismal Service should also permit as an alternative the use of the more primitive Baptismal formula 'into the name of the Lord Jesus' where the use of this formula is expressly requested by parents and godparents. This formula is not only the most ancient Christian baptismal formula (as we see from the Pauline Epistles, etc.), but was affirmed to be valid and orthodox by Pope Nicholas I as late as the ninth century.

(5) While advocating the retention of the reference to Episcopal Confirmation, we would urge that where the parents are not members of the Church of England and do not intend that the infant shall be brought up to be a member of the Church of England, reference to Confirmation may be omitted from the Baptismal Service at the express request of the parents and godparents.

(6) We strongly favour the retention of the Sign of the Cross.

(7) We advocate the holding of the Infant Baptismal Service on Sunday afternoon (particularly on Easter Day and Whitsunday), and that the children of the parish with as many as possible of their adult relations should attend the service.

(8) At such a service, we advocate the delivery of a short and simple address explaining Infant Baptism.

(9) We also favour the singing of appropriate Psalms and Hymns.

(10) In churches where flowers are used to decorate the altar, flowers may also appropriately be used to decorate the font.

(11) We advocate the giving of Baptismal Cards (especially such as contain a prayer for the child baptized) to the parents and godparents, together with a booklet on Infant Baptism.[2]

(12) We advocate (at least in our new churches) that the font be placed in such a position that in order to face it the congregation shall not have to turn West. Such a position might conveniently be secured in the East end of the nave or in one of the transepts.

The following Baptismal Service attempts to implement those principles and methods of revision which we have advocated.

A REVISED SERVICE OF INFANT BAPTISM.

It is desirable that a short and simple address be delivered on the meaning and value of Infant Baptism.

The address ended, the following Psalm may be sung:

(Psalm lxxxiv, 1-5, 12, 13.)

O how amiable are thy dwellings: thou Lord of hosts!

My soul hath a desire and longing to enter into the courts of the Lord: my heart and my flesh rejoice in the living God.

Yea, the sparrow hath found her an house and the swallow a nest where she may lay her young: even thy altars, O Lord of hosts, my King and my God.

Blessed are they that dwell in thy house: they will be alway praising thee.

Blessed is the man whose strength is in thee: in whose heart are thy ways.

For the Lord God is a light and defence: the Lord will give grace and worship, and no good thing shall he withhold from them that live a godly life.

O Lord God of hosts: blessed is the man that putteth his trust in thee.

[2] Such a booklet (*What Baptism Means*), price 1*d.*, can be obtained from the Honorary Secretary of the Modern Churchmen's Union.

The Parents and Godparents standing at the font and the congregation standing facing the font, the Minister shall say:

Hear the words of the Gospel according to Saint Mark, written in the tenth chapter at the thirteenth verse:

They brought young children to Christ, that He should touch them; and His disciples rebuked those that brought them. But when Jesus saw it He was much displeased, and said unto them, Suffer the little children to come unto Me and forbid them not, for of such is the Kingdom of God. Verily I say unto you, whosoever shall not receive the Kingdom of God as a little child he shall not enter therein. And He took them up in his arms, laid His hands upon them and blessed them.

Brothers and sisters in Christ, forasmuch as this child is God's child, you have brought *him* here that *he* may by Baptism be dedicated to God, His Heavenly Father, and admitted into the Church which is the fellowship of God's Son, Jesus Christ Our Lord.

The Parents and Sponsors shall declare their assent by answering Amen.

Let us pray.

O God, the Creator and Father of Mankind, we beseech Thee to bestow the blessing of Eternal Life upon *this child* whom we now dedicate to Thee: and grant that *he*, increasing daily in the knowledge of Thee and of Thy Son, Jesus Christ, may ever grow into Thy Divine likeness. *Amen.*

Then shall the Minister speak to the Parents and Godparents as follows:

Beloved, in order that the saving power of Baptism may work in *this child*, it must be united to his Christian education:

Will you therefore faithfully train and help *him* to resist all evil?

Answer: I will.

Will you take care that *he* be instructed in the Christian Faith?

Answer: I will.

Will you pray for *him* and by word and deed encourage *him* to keep God's holy will and commandments and to walk in the same all the days of *his* life?

Answer: I will.

Let us pray.

O Heavenly Father,

Grant to *this child* the spiritual strength to withstand temptation and to overcome the forces of evil. *Amen.*

Grant to *this child* the power of victorious faith and the daily assurance that Thou art Mighty to save. *Amen.*

Grant to *this child* that being brought up in the true knowledge of Thee and of Thy Son Jesus Christ *he* may never depart from the way that leadeth unto Eternal Life. *Amen.*

O Lord and Heavenly Father, whose Beloved Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ, was Himself baptized, and by His Spirit gave commandment to His disciples to teach all nations and baptize them; grant that Baptism may be to *this child* the abiding pledge of Thy Fatherly love, through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

Here may be sung the following Psalm:

(Psalm cxix, 73, 33-35.)

Thy hands have made me and fashioned me: O give me understanding, that I may learn thy commandments.

Teach me, O Lord, the way of thy statutes: and I shall keep it unto the end.

Give me understanding, and I shall keep thy law: yea, I shall keep it with my whole heart.

Make me to go in the path of thy commandments: for therein is my desire.

Then shall the Minister take the child into his arms and say:
Name *this child.*

Then, naming it, he shall baptize it with water, saying:

N. I baptize thee in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. *Amen.*

or

N. I baptize thee in the Name of the Lord Jesus Christ. *Amen.*

Then shall the Minister say:

We receive *this child* into the congregation of Christ's flock and do sign *him* with the sign of the Cross, in token that hereafter *he* shall not be ashamed to confess the faith of Christ Crucified, but manfully to fight under His banner against all evil, and continue Christ's faithful soldier and servant unto *his life's* end. *Amen.*

Here may be sung the following hymn:

Fight the good fight with all thy might,
Christ is thy strength, and Christ thy right;
Lay hold on life, and it shall be
Thy joy and crown eternally.

Run the straight race through God's good grace,
Lift up thine eyes, and seek his face;
Life with its way before thee lies,
Christ is the path and Christ the prize.

Faint not nor fear, his arms are near,
He changeth not and thou art dear;
Only believe, and thou shalt see
That Christ is all in all to thee.

Let us pray.

We yield Thee hearty thanks, most gracious Father, that it hath pleased Thee to receive *this child* into the fellowship of Christ's Church. Grant that *he* may ever be a loyal and loving member of this fellowship through Jesus Christ Our Lord. *Amen.*

Let us all say together the Lord's Prayer:

Our Father, which art in heaven, Hallowed be Thy Name; Thy Kingdom come; Thy Will be done, in earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread, and forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us; And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil; For Thine is the Kingdom, the Power and the Glory, for ever and ever. *Amen.*

Then the Minister shall say to the Parents and Godparents:

Forasmuch as you have promised to train *this child* to be a Christian: I therefore beseech you in the name of Our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lover of little children, that you fail not in this your promise. Earnestly endeavour to fit yourselves for the faithful discharge of your duty in this matter, and let your daily life be such that *this child* may ever look on you with love and reverence, and learn the lesson of true religion from your life as well as from your lips.

You are to take care that *this child* be taught to say *his* Prayers and to attend Divine Worship; so that in due course *he* may be brought to the Bishop to be confirmed by him, and thereafter be admitted to the Holy Communion.

Then shall the Minister let them depart with a blessing:

The Peace of God which passeth all understanding keep your hearts and minds in the knowledge and love of God, and of His Son, Jesus Christ, Our Lord. *Amen.*

or

The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit be with you all. *Amen.*

Psalm xxiii (The Lord is my shepherd) or one of the English versions by George Herbert, Joseph Addison, or H. W. Baker, may be sung as a Recessional.

BOOK REVIEWS

A GREAT LEADER OF REACTION*

'Between us and you there is a great gulf fixed' has been my feeling in reading this book, though it is hardly such 'that those who would pass from hence to you cannot,' neither is the passage across it a one-way street; and if the late Dr. Darwell Stone had known that his biography would fall to be so ably written by a former Chaplain and Tutor of Ripon Hall, his appreciation of excellent work and his sense of humour would have allowed him to recognise at least one good thing in the comprehensiveness of the Church of England.

A clerical life without known incident, excitement or great achievement in youth, and in maturity independent of preferment neither sought, desired nor attained; spent as to one year in a curacy, as to eighteen years successively Vice-Principal and Principal of a Missionary Theological College, and then as to thirty years a Librarian and later (since 1909) as Principal of Pusey House—this is hardly likely to afford much material for thrilling biography; and, even for those interested in such a life and its work, nothing would have been easier than to produce a volume chiefly valued by sufferers from insomnia. Dr. Cross has carried out a difficult task extremely well. By good selection and by neither following a chronological order nor constantly interrupting the narrative with lengthy letters, he has written what is in itself a very readable book and one which students will both use and value. It is a first-rate performance.

Dr. Stone was a man of massive ecclesiastical learning and manifest goodness, well endowed with that evangelic wisdom which is made more effective by a dove-like dress. By his writings, his activities in Anglo-Catholic ecclesiastical politics and societies, and later in the Church Assembly, as well as constantly behind the scenes in all the outstanding events in any way connected with theology, he exercised a very great influence upon the life of the Church of England in recent years,[1] faithfully serving what he was convinced were its best interests while hardly loving it as it is. Outwardly he was a very reserved man. In ordinary intercourse he talked little, but always to the point. He worked steadily and for long hours every day except during an annual holiday of a month or so. Quite imperturbable, always gentle and polite, people were apt to find him well informed on matters in which no one would have dreamed that he took the slightest interest. As a young man, for example, it was observed that he would know the name of the last year's Derby winner which the worldlings had forgotten. Once, when interrupted about some ecclesiastical question while on holiday, he sent the following message which bears the hall-mark of genuineness: 'Tell X that I am not able to give my attention to anything other than the racing intelligence in *The Times* newspaper.' Another typically ready answer was given when he gently squashed a youthfully pert inquiry as to his acquaintance with the Dolly sisters by asking if they were a community. Some may think it symbolic that he was 'always happiest when the sky was overclouded' and that he could describe the sun as 'the great enemy,' which is thought to explain why, in the present Pusey House built during his Principalship, most of the rooms face north.[2]

Dean Church and Canon Liddon were the main formative influences in his student days and their influence was permanent. His beliefs and opinions show no important change or development throughout his life. He was essentially a dogmatic theologian in the traditional sense, that is, he knew with

[1] Dr. Cross possibly over-estimates Stone's share in securing the rejection of the Revised Prayer Book, though it was undoubtedly great.

* *Darwell Stone: Life, Letters and Papers*, by F. L. Cross. (Dacre Press. pp. xxvi and 447. Price 30/-.)

[2] The book contains an excellent character-sketch by the Rev. Frederic Hood, Stone's successor in the Principalship.

exactness what historical Christianity is and what its leading exponents had taught about it. This he expounded, and this he would defend on the presupposition that what he regarded as its fundamentals were revealed truths open neither to revision nor to question. His knowledge of the Patristic literature and of the writings of the Schoolmen was probably more extensive than that of any contemporary English Churchman. The present writer was once on Oxford station with a well-known dignitary when Dr. Stone glided up the platform. (No man could have walked with less appearance of physical movement.) I remarked that what Dr. Stone did not know about the Fathers was not worth knowing. 'No,' replied the Dean, 'it isn't; and the same is true of what he does know.'

I confine this notice to the two fundamental positions Stone adopted, which determined all his writing and ecclesiastical policy.

The first was that the Church's task is to be a witness to the faith which she has received. Her teaching is a divine gift and absolute truth. What is required in its apprehension is not intellectual acumen but a spirit of submission and acceptance — 'the appropriation through faith of a supernatural deposit committed to the Church at the first' (p. 40). The whole truth was not revealed at once, but what was revealed was absolutely true. There is 'a radical cleavage between the natural and the supernatural orders,' and consequently the method of revelation is 'different in kind from the means of acquiring other knowledge.' The question whether anything taught as a religious truth is certainly true simply depends on whether it is within or outside the revelation. Because prophecy 'is a supernatural interposition of the direct working of God, we shall reasonably infer that every detail in it which is part of the prophetical announcement will be rightly foretold.'

This attitude to Holy Scripture differs from Fundamentalism in that for Stone the Church, not the individual, is the true interpreter of the Bible, and the main stream of Christian interpretation is classically embodied in the writings of the early Church. But the difference from Fundamentalism is more formal than real, and any small modifications which Stone accepted in later life had no influence whatever upon his dogmatic teaching. He further held that

> 'many difficulties about Holy Scripture have been in part due to an effect produced by retaining the theory of verbal inspiration which the Fathers held, and rejecting the co-ordinate theory of mystical interpretation by which it was lightened.'

His doctrine of Scripture and of the method of revelation enabled Stone to see at once and clearly wherein the writers in *Lux Mundi* departed from the traditional position. It was on this basis that he criticised Gore's view that the inspiration of Biblical writers intensified but did not supersede their human faculties, and felt that it led to a position not consistent either with Holy Scripture or with the teaching of the Christian Church. The same doctrine led him to object to the bracketing of certain verses in the Psalter in the revised Prayer Books of 1927-28, for he held that if all passages which on a literalist interpretation were to be excised others no less foreign to the Gospel should have come out. If the principle of mystical interpretation is admitted there was no difficulty in reciting the bracketed portions; if it is not admitted it would be necessary to omit much more:

> 'My own opinion is that without the recognition of the mystical interpretation the use of the Psalms and of the Old Testament generally cannot eventually be retained in public worship.'

The other fundamental determining factor in Stone's outlook was what Dr. Cross describes as

> 'a view of the Church immensely wider than that held by the general run of contemporary English Churchmen. For the sources of faith he looked less

> to the specifically Anglican formularies than to the teaching of the whole Catholic Church, Eastern and (especially) Western . . . By contrast the Anglican doctrinal and liturgical formulae of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries seemed to bear the limitations of a particular age, and . . . often presented themselves to him more as obstacles to be surmounted than as positive contributions to the exhibition of faith.'

His ideal was frankly to eliminate 'from the Tractarian exposition of Anglicanism its remaining particularist elements.'

A colleague of Stone's in his early days as Principal of Dorchester Missionary College writes that under his influence

> 'my whole outlook became less provincial; it acquired a metropolis, and that metropolis was Rome.'

From two, and as far as I can judge from only two, important Roman doctrines did he dissent: the infallibility of the Pope and the claim that to be in communion with the Church Christians must be in external communion with the Pope. But here, as always, he was explicit:

> 'If these doctrines are true, whatever the Church of England may be or do, those who are faithful to the truth must become Roman Catholics . . . if the doctrines are not true, no amount of failure in the Church of England would make it right to accept them.'

From this position he never wavered. But on all other matters he became less and less willing to criticise specifically Roman teaching, and he was eager that 'Roman Catholic Eucharistic practice should be adopted in the Church of England.' For the *via media* of Anglicanism, as an excellence, he had no use whatever:

> 'One would search in vain for elements of positive value in the Anglican formularies of the sixteenth century.'

He was convinced that their compilers held doctrine at variance with Catholic teaching, and though we were not obliged to accept their opinions, the nature of their teaching made it impossible to claim that their formularies were capable of only one—the Anglo-Catholic—interpretation. He was sure that the Oxford Movement leaders were far too sanguine in thinking that the appeal to the Reformation formularies gave positive support to their beliefs, and he disliked appealing to them. He wrote frankly:

> 'I am very sure that on several important questions—the Eucharist is pre-eminent — a claim that these formularies have only one meaning will lead to that one meaning being the Protestant one.'

And of two able writers he said:

> 'Their discomfiture was complete when they tried to argue that the present formularies and the post-Reformation English divines were committed to the necessity of episcopal ordination as distinct from the practical requirement in the Church of England' (p. 244).
>
> 'There always seems to me to have been something providential in the notion of the Tractarians that they had support for their position in a post-Reformation tradition, because without this belief they very likely would not have had the heart to go on. But I think we have now to face the fact that, so far as the Reformation and post-Reformation formularies and divines are concerned, there are loopholes which we can use, but not the support for an exclusive position' (p. 245).

In this respect, as in all else, Stone's opinions were most honestly expressed. They were extremely rigid but were held with a large and sometimes an astonishing concession of freedom to those who differed widely from him. No mind could have combined greater rigidity with larger tolerance.

Though never eager for controversy and not seldom applying an effective brake upon suggestions which would have led to it, Stone never shrank from it when convinced of its necessity, and his influence both within and outside the Church Assembly was often due to his quiet firmness. One illustration may be given. In 1916 it was thought that the bishops proposed to take concerted action with a view to a more rigid regulation of Reservation and to prohibit access to the reserved sacramental bread for purposes of private devotion. In Stone's circle it was decided to present the bishops with a widely signed memorial. The drafting was largely his, and it included a warning that compliance with the contemplated restriction 'cannot rightly be demanded and will not be given.' It was urged upon him that 'ought not to be given' would be better. He insisted upon 'will'; for 'what will weigh with the bishops is much more what will in fact happen than what may be considered right.'

This book abounds, within the limits of Dr. Stone's unquestioned assumptions, in detailed knowledge, sound and rounded thought and practical wisdom. At its end, Dr. Cross invites readers to consider whether, in Stone's presence, they are in the presence of a saint. Some can use that title more easily than others; but if it is to be used at all, my impression is that few would think it improperly applied to the subject of this biography. Astonishingly free from familiar frailties, completely indifferent to earthly rewards, Stone's life seems to have been one of unwavering dedication and complete interior harmony. It is perhaps a sign of the deep integration of his personality that, to one whose personal contacts with him were slight, this large book which contains so much that informs contains nothing that surprises. What Stone appeared to be, that he was.

There is, however, a further and less personal question. The importance of this book is that it reveals at first hand to Evangelicals and Liberals what Anglo-Catholicism is and whither it leads, in the clear words of its most successful leader; for it was not the more Liberal Catholics but Stone who exercised so large an influence in our modern ecclesiastical affairs. His biographer realises that Stone's outlook was remote from the world in which he lived. He seems never to have been troubled by the perplexing questions for religious faith which loomed so largely, and often to the loss of faith, in his lifetime; nor does he appear to have been moved by the fact that so many of the ablest men and finest characters of his day, influenced though they were by the Christian tradition, could not even begin to take seriously what to him was certain truth. That he should have exercised the leadership and influence in the Church which he unquestionably did is a tribute to his learning, consistency and wisdom within the limits of the position he (apparently uncritically) adopted, and to his personal goodness; but it makes it difficult to entertain a very favourable opinion of the large section of churchmen who, in the twentieth century, could follow such leadership.

J. S. Bezzant.

SELECTED CHURCH DOCUMENTS IN ENGLISH*

This latest addition to the World's Classics Series is likely to prove welcome to theological students. Its wide range will make it of lesser value to the student of special periods, but for those who have to cover, more or less, the whole of Church history, as is required for the General Ordination Examination, it should prove an invaluable source-book. In view of the decay of classical learning an English version of documents not always easily available in translation will be acceptable to many. The main difficulty in compiling such a work as this is the task of omission. Thus the ample space devoted to

* *Documents of the Christian Church.* Selected and edited by Henry Bettenson. (O.U.P. 1943. 3/-.)

Luther may be contrasted with the one extract from Calvin, of whose theological powers Mr. Bettenson thinks meanly. The reader should also be warned of a strong Anglo-Catholic bias in these selections. For nineteenth-century England he has to be content with extracts from Keble's Assize Sermon on National Apostasy and from Newman's Tract 90. The selections to illustrate the Anglicanism of the seventeenth century are taken from that one-sided compilation, More and Cross, *Anglicanism*. Mr. Bettenson (p. 410) makes the surprising, if illuminating, statement that Anglicanism came into being between 1594, when the first four books of Hooker's 'Ecclesiastical Polity' were published, and the accession of William and Mary, when the Non-jurors seceded. It would be interesting to learn what label Mr. Bettenson would give to the established religion of the greater part of Elizabeth's reign. Extracts from Cranmer and Jewel would be in place. A useful section is devoted to the Deistic controversy, whose importance is often overlooked. Mr. Bettenson uses, on the whole, good and recent sources, but Wace and Buchheim, Luther's Primary Works (1896) and Curteis' Bampton Lectures on Dissent (1871) might have been bettered. There is a competent index.

P. R. SMYTHE.

ST. JOHN OF THE CROSS *

In a volume of one hundred and fifty pages, the Gilmour Professor of Spanish in the University of Liverpool introduces us to one of the greatest of the Christian mystics. Professor Allison Peers is already well known to many for his 'Studies in the Spanish Mystics,' and his translation of the complete works of St. John of the Cross. Here, as he tells us in his foreword, he is trying 'to introduce him to many who have neither the time or the training to study the three large volumes of the works.' It is appropriate, then, that the present work is divided into two parts. First, we are given a very readable account of the short life of St. John of the Cross. Here the writer has provided us with some interesting sidelights on the state of the Church in Spain in Counter-Reformation days. But for many, the more important section of the work will be that entitled 'The Mystic and the World of To-day,' in which the writer considers some of the misgivings with which the modern man approaches mystical literature.

St. John was born at Fontiveros on the plateau of Castile. 'It is both appropriate and stimulating,' says his biographer, 'to associate a saint whose teaching, uncompromising and austere, was always so sharply outlined, and whose whole life was directed towards so clearly envisaged a goal, with the keenness and purity of that mountain climate.' We learn of his education at a Jesuit school. Apparently, even at an early age, John was attracted to a life of contemplation, rather than to that of the newly-founded militant Society. For it was the Carmelites whom he joined; immediately after his profession, he started a course of studies at Salamanca, then one of the four leading universities in Europe.

It was shortly after the completion of his University course that the really important event in John's life took place. His biographer prefaces his account of it with some wise words about the nature of a call from God. The great event was, of course, his meeting with St. Teresa, a Carmelite nun, many years his senior. Some years previously, being dissatisfied with the life of her convent, she had obtained permission to found an order based upon the primitive and stricter Carmelite rule of life. This was the 'Discalced' or Barefooted Order of Carmelites. Anxious to extend this Reform to men's houses, she had already secured one recruit when she met John.

* *Spirit of Flame*: A Study of St. John of the Cross. By E. Allison Peers. (S.C.M. 6/-.)

Professor Peers gives a most interesting account of the setting up of a house at Duruelo, describing it, not without reason, as 'the extreme limit of the simple life.' Even the Mother Foundress was apprehensive of the friars' austerity, fearing that it would not attract recruits. But her fears were groundless.

> 'The fact is,' says the writer, 'that genuine spirituality invariably inspires respect, and though many religious reformers have at first had to endure the uncomprehending world's enmity and persecution, they have always ended by asserting their influence upon it.'

It is not surprising, then, that before long the Reform moved to Mancera, and that a second foundation was set up at Pastrana. Eventually, John settled at Avila, as confessor to Teresa's original convent of the Incarnation, where, according to Teresa, he did 'a great deal of good.' The two were in close association here, for she was ordered back as Prioress of her original convent.

There follows a chapter describing the first troubled period of John's life. It arose out of a serious dissension between those who kept the Mitigated Rule of the Carmelites, and those of the Discalced Reform, and it culminated in a quarrel over the re-election of St. Teresa as Prioress at Avila. The Provincial of the Mitigation used all means to ensure that she should not be re-elected, and all John's attempts to intervene were fruitless. There followed the attack upon him by the leaders of the Mitigation, and his removal by force from Avila, and shameful treatment. His biographer makes no attempt to apologise for this revelation of the low average level upon which the Orders lived, but reminds us that 'in religious history as well as in social and political history, the sixteenth century and the twentieth were a long way apart — and that even the twentieth century is far from being perfect.' Yet it was now that, for the first time, St. John was thrown back entirely upon God. For the first time, he wrote poetry, above all part of one of his greatest works, 'The Spiritual Canticle,' the first literary expression of his mystical theology. The theme of the Canticle is the familiar one of the soul seeking her Beloved. 'Who,' asks the writer, 'would dream of the almost unbelievable conditions in which the stanzas were written?'

> 'Surely the idea of doing so must have been suggested to him by his own spiritual anguish. Surely on some evening, the shadows of that prison must have merged into the deeper shadows of the Dark Night of the Soul, and his Calvary, like his Master's, have suddenly become a Calvary of despair as he felt the stab of that intolerable realisation that he had lost the Divine companionship.'

This sojourn in prison was terminated by a lucky escape. Here many readers will be grateful to Professor Peers for his sane treatment of the traditional stories of supernatural help. There follows the account of his joyful appearance at the Reformed convent at Toledo, where St. John led the sisters into the chapel, and there read to them the poems which he had written.

We now approach the really great literary period of John's life. He writes extensive commentaries upon his three greatest poems. 'The Ascent of Mount Carmel,' the Mount of Perfection, is based upon the poem 'Dark Night.' Professor Peers suggests that here again an outstanding event in the life of the saint is the obvious basis for the poem:

> 'Is it not likely that those phrases were written down by their author as an exact and literal description of his escape, and that he built upon them the narrative which follows much as he built the "Spiritual Canticle" upon the cry wrung from him by some poignant moment of his distress?'

Here the writer introduces us to the teaching of St. John on the Mystic Way.

From the first book of 'the Ascent of Mount Carmel' on the Night of Sense, which deals mainly with mortification, he quotes:

> 'Strive always to choose, not that which is easiest, but that which is most difficult;
> Not that which is most delectable, but that which is most unpleasing;
> Not that which gives most pleasure, but rather that which gives least,'

rightly remarking that they 'strike terror into all but the most resolute.'

After this period, John spent two years as Rector of a newly-established Carmelite College at Baeza. Here his biographer reveals one of his weaknesses — as a good Castilian, he disliked Andalusians. It was at this time that, by a Bull of Gregory XIII (the reformer of the Calendar), the Discalced were established as a separate Province of the Carmelite Order. The Mother of the Reform did not live long to enjoy the success of her cause. Shortly afterwards, John departed again, this time to be Prior of the monastery of Los Martires, near Granada. Here it was that 'The Ascent of Mount Carmel' was in fact, if not in letter, completed by the 'Dark Night of the Soul,' the subject-matter of which is complementary to the Night of Sense. His last commentary, 'Living Flame of Love,' deals exclusively with 'that most ineffable of earthly experiences — "the most perfect degree of perfection to which a man may attain in this life, which is transformation in God"' — Union, the goal of the Mystic Way.

It is sad to think that the end of John's life was to be clouded by yet another storm. Yet it serves as a useful reminder that the outwardly peaceful life is not the essential prerequisite for the kind of religious experience that John knew and described so well.

> 'Twice during his comparatively short life of forty-nine years, St. John of the Cross was plunged into the dark night of physical and mental suffering: once by the friars of the Mitigated Rule which he had renounced soon after the beginning of his career, and once by the friars of the very Reform which he had been so largely instrumental in promoting. These two experiences may be considered strangely symbolic of two of the most characteristic features of his description of the Mystic Way — the Dark Night of Sense and the "more horrible and awful" Dark Night of the Spirit.'

John was moved to protest in 1591 against the attempt of the Vicar-General to revoke the Teresan Constitution of 1581, and refashion the Reform according to his own ideas. But the protest was not supported, and so John came to end his days as a simple friar again. He was sent to a lonely friary as a virtual exile. There he fell ill. He journeyed to a new Discalced foundation in search of medical aid, although in truth 'there were no comforts to be had in Discalced monasteries, and even had there been any, John would probably not have accepted them.' Immediately he experienced the intense hostility of his prior host, and when the pressure of friends removed this, it was too late. So he died on December 14th, 1591, before he had attained his fiftieth year.

Professor Peers concludes this account of the life with an assessment of the character of the saint.

> 'Perhaps the fairest assessment of his character would be to say that while fully capable of doing business with this world, he was first, last and all the time a man of the next.'

He stresses his quality of 'sheer goodness.' As a nun wrote, 'It always seemed that his soul was at prayer.' It is admitted that the saint is less outstanding as a ruler of men, and seems to have been an indifferent orator. Where he excelled was in the art of training souls. His biographer stresses

his love of music and Nature, and his interest in arts and crafts. He is not blind to his weaknesses, and readily admits that 'to take literally everything that was said of him from ten to forty years after his death would be to turn him into a saint who never existed except in a church window.' But that such things could be said is sufficient testimony of the greatness of the man.

The second part of this volume, entitled 'The Mystic and the World of To-day,' should be of particular interest to many readers. Here Professor Peers considers the uniqueness of St. John of the Cross, whom he compares only with St. Augustine and John Ruysbroeck. He criticises many people for regarding John solely as the 'Doctor of the Dark Night,' and stresses his universal appeal, and the variety of his attainments.

> 'He is a man of the world precisely because he lives apart from the world, and his familiarity with human nature is accompanied by an understanding of it given only to those who can regard it with complete objectivity.'

A further chapter considers the works from a literary standpoint. In describing St. John as 'The Mystic's Mystic,' the writer attacks the common view that none save advanced contemplatives can appreciate the writings. This leads on to two chapters on 'Stumbling Blocks.' The author attempts answers to most of the common objections brought against not only St. John, but Christian mystics in general. In particular, he answers the charge that the mystic is always a selfish person, caring only for the good of his own soul, and the common view that the aim of the mystic is the extinction of his personality in union with God. Professor Peers also brings forward an answer to the objection that the doctrine of St. John is completely unbiblical, and shows how steeped the saint was in the language and thought of Holy Scripture, even if his source is not immediately obvious. He defends the teaching on detachment, on the ground that it is not meant for everybody. 'The idea that he makes impossible demands upon everybody is a sheer legend.' The final chapter explains the attractiveness of St. John's teaching for to-day.

> 'No one has charted more of this spiritual land than St. John of the Cross. And though it may never be our "happy chance" to make the journey, the knowledge that the goal exists is surely an invitation to us to tighten up our spiritual life and nerve ourselves to set out for at least a small part of the way.'

It is to be expected that many will view the prospect of reading this work with all the prejudices of the average Englishman against St. John of the Cross and that for which he stood. The ecclesiastical background to the life of the saint may be unfamiliar or unattractive. The language of his devotion may be foreign in more senses than one to English ears. But while we cannot agree with those who claim from time to time that only the Church of Rome has produced saints since the Reformation, it is surely incumbent upon us to know more than we do of the saints that Roman Catholicism has produced. Even the meanest Christian of any tradition has this in common with the mystic, that his aim, however imperfectly achieved, is the knowledge and the love of God. Surely at this point, it matters little whether the mystic be Roman Catholic, Quaker, or Anglican. The S.C.M. Religious Book Club is to be congratulated upon this choice. And Professor Allison Peers is to be congratulated upon his effort to introduce to a wider circle of readers not only St. John of the Cross, but also mystical theology. If it is his hope that the reading of this small work may lead to the desire to seek a closer acquaintance with this class of writer, he may rest assured that this is in the mind of at least one reader.

J. S. Hannon.

DR. CADOUX ON THE HISTORIC MISSION OF JESUS*

It is refreshing in these days to have such a fine study of the Synoptic Gospels from the Liberal point of view, particularly as we are often told with wearisome reiteration that the Liberal theology has had its day, yet as Dr. Cadoux well remarks:

> 'This "liberal" account of Jesus was not so far astray from the truth as many modern theologians would have us believe — certainly not so far astray as is the version which some of them are recommending us to substitute for it' (p. 3).

It is refreshing also to find the Vice-Principal of Mansfield College, Oxford, is not one of these Free Church theologians who profess to be 'High Calvinists'; and he has no sympathy with the Barthian theology.

Dr. Cadoux, and rightly, paid no attention to the Johannine problem, as that would only complicate matters, and besides, it is not nearly so near a solution as is that of the Synoptic problem. There is really nothing fresh in the book, but it is good indication of present knowledge. He accepts, and rightly so, the theory of Dr. Streeter's Four-Document Hypothesis, which better accounts for the facts as we find them than does any of its alternatives. His treatment of the Virgin Birth, the Miracles, the Resurrection, and the Ascension is frankly modernist. No doubt in facing up to the facts of modern criticism, there is loss as well as gain, and many will regret the assumption that the Walk to Emmaus (*Luke* xxiv) is not historical.

Dr. Cadoux is level-headed and sensible in his treatment of Form-Criticism, for, though it throws valuable light on the obscure process by which oral tradition, devotional imagination, and primitive records were built up between the life of Jesus and the composition of the canonical Gospels, it must ever be largely subjective and conjectural, and regarding the way in which some orthodox theologians have welcomed it, for reasons of their own, he humourously remarks that 'mystery acquaints a man with strange bed-fellows.' It is significant that Drs. Karl Ludwig Schmidt and Rudolf Bultmann, two of the most sceptical of the Form-Critics, have strong sympathy with Barthian views.

The arrangement of the book is excellent, and useful summaries at the commencement of each chapter allow the reader to follow the course of the argument easily. Naturally with such a complex subject, the reviewer does not find himself able to agree with all the author's conclusions. For example, Dr. Cadoux is of the opinion that Jesus did not know the *Book of Enoch*. To the present writer it appears that His apocalyptist utterances are all coloured by that book, though one admits the difficulty of ascertaining how many of the apocalyptic utterances attributed to Him in the Gospels were actually spoken by Him.

On the question whether Jesus anticipated death at the commencement of His ministry Dr. Cadoux is very satisfactory. He says:

> 'Assuming the Marco-Lucan chronology to be trustworthy on this point, it does not, of course, necessarily follow that the thought of the Passion could not have occurred to Him earlier; it may have done so, and Jesus for certain reasons may have said nothing to His Disciples about it for some time. Yet it is surely more natural, seeing that Caesarea-Philippi evidently constituted an important landmark in the development of His Messianic thought and teaching, to suppose that the virtual conviction that He must suffer death had come to him recently, rather than that He had been silently nursing it throughout the whole earlier period of the Ministry' (p. 191).

The author speaks well on the question of the intellectual infallibility of Jesus. All theologians and students of Scripture should note these words:

* *The Historic Mission of Jesus*, by C. J. Cadoux, D.D. (Lutterworth Press. 21/-. 1942.)

'Of those Christians who see the intellectual infallibility of Jesus cannot be maintained, many try to guard themselves by urging that the limitations of His knowledge affected only those matters which are of no moral or religious importance; the supposition is arbitrary. For the limitation in question arose from the impression made upon His thoughts by the teaching to which as a Jewish boy He had been subjected. That teaching clearly embodied ideas concerning the character of God as well as beliefs concerning the authorship of the Pentateuch and the Psalms and concerning the life after death. We must, of course, recognize that Jesus Himself immensely modified and transformed this body of traditional teaching by His own inspiration and insight: but we cannot in reason profess to believe that He had a truly-human nature and "increased in wisdom" as in stature, and at the same time assume that He had wholly emancipated Himself from every existing flaw in the current religious belief of his people' (pp. 343-44).

This book should be on the shelf of all students of theology.

S. H. N. PILCHER.

HOW TO READ THE OLD TESTAMENT

Canon Alan Richardson, of Durham, a leading personality in the Student Christian Movement, has just produced a popular booklet entitled *How to read the Bible with Special Reference to the Old Testament*.[1] His reason for restriction to the Old Testament is because Professor C. H. Dodd has produced a booklet entitled *How to read the Gospels* in the same series.

Canon Richardson in performing this difficult task, how difficult only those know who try to popularise modern Biblical knowledge, makes judicious use of the practical results of Biblical research. While abandoning in the most unpretentious way the strongly held, but never rigidly formulated, Christian belief in the plenary verbal infallibility of the Scriptures, he stresses the doctrine of a Biblical inspiration. He writes under the heading 'Our Truth or God's Truth':

'The truth is rather that men have treasured the Bible, not because it enshrines their noblest thoughts about God, but because it contains *God's* message to men. The significance of the Bible, as Christians understand the matter, lies in the fact that it records what God has to say to the world. Obviously, if that is true, the Bible is unique: it is different from every other book that has ever been produced.

'If we merely thought of the Bible as the record of the evolution of *men's* religious beliefs and hopes, or the expression of *our* highest thoughts about God, it would not be different in its essential nature from other books of the same kind, and it would not be unreasonable to believe that some day men would develop still nobler thoughts about God and would produce a still richer and purer Bible than ours. But that is not what the Christian believes to be the importance of the Bible. For him the Bible is important in a way in which no other book has ever been or can ever be, because it is the record of God's message to men. It speaks of something which *God* has done and revealed, something which men could not have done or discovered for themselves.'

We confess to feeling dissatisfied with this way of presenting the claims of the Bible. Is not the contrast between Divine Revelation and the human evolution of religion (where that evolution is on right lines) a radically false distinction? Are not Divine Revelation and Religious Evolution the same creative act of God viewed from opposite standpoints?

To take another point: every serious and open-minded student of the sacred

[1] *How to read the Bible*, by the Rev. Alan Richardson, B.D. (Press and Publications Board. 6*d*. 1943).

books of mankind cannot agree that it is true and just to class the Bible as Divine and all other religious literature as human. The head of a woman's college, a fellow-traveller with the late Alfred Fawkes in Palestine, remarked to him, when they were camping at Dan and hoped next day to reach Damascus: 'To-night we are in the land of the *Old Testament*; to-morrow we shall be in the land of the *Arabian Nights*.' Fawkes replied: 'And how much alike those two books are.' If Fawkes was guilty of humorous depreciation, surely Canon Richardson is guilty of pious exaggeration. In some respects the Old Testament is human — all too human. Bishop Boyd-Carpenter, one of the great forward-glancing Christian teachers of the period which ended with the Great War, in his popular little volume, *An Introduction to the Study of the Scriptures*,[2] handled this difficult problem with finer insight. At the outset he places the Bible in the class of great literature, which he calls inspired literature. Here it stands with the world's great classics, but inspiration is of various kinds. The Bishop justly remarks, in those pre-Barthian days, that, while all inspiration comes from God, all inspiration does not lead to God. It is the characteristic of the inspiration of the Bible that it not only comes from God but that it leads to God. The distinction, however, can be pursued further: not only is Divine inspiration of different kinds but it is of different degrees. All religious inspiration leads to God, but the lower kinds of inspiration lead us to very crude, inadequate and erroneous ideas of the Divine Nature: the supreme value of the religious inspiration of the Bible is that it leads those who study it aright to the very highest and truest presentation of God — a presentation which unveils the Divine Nature with such cogency, authority and attraction as to win to faith, obedience and adoration those to whom God is thus unveiled.

We hope that Canon Richardson will re-write for later editions pages 2 and 3 of his able little book. His advice as to the order of Bible-reading is admirable, and he makes the right use of the assured results of modern Biblical criticism. Begin with the Gospels, proceed next to the writing prophets of the eighth century B.C. — Amos, Hosea, etc. — then after the goodly company of the prophets, study the legal codes of the Pentateuch: then go to the Psalms, the hymn-book of the second temple, and here let the reader make his own anthology: then read the story of the origins of Israel's national life and national religion, etc. Appendix II with its Biblical passages arranged for reading is most suggestive. H.D.A.M.

BUNYAN CALLING

'The highway between Bedford and the village of Elstow was but roughly made; on it horse-pads lay thick, some dry, some filled with water which the sun-blink through low-lying clouds turned into plates of steel. In the furrows of the ploughed fields crows fluttered, squawking after worms. The stalwart man who was walking along the road wore the leathern apron of the smith. He was deep in thought, a big-boned fellow with reddish hair, ruddy cheeks, compelling eyes and thick humorous lips. A man of power and country-bred.'

This initial paragraph of *Bunyan Calling*,* by M. P. Willcocks, might give the innocent reader to believe that he was opening a novel. But it is not so. He is merely picking up a specimen of the fashionable romantic biography. From the writer's standpoint this has the advantage over the historical novel that the facts are given so that no plot has to be invented. But the rest of the novelist's technique may be employed, even to the invention of dialogue in the more daring instances. Such works may provide a diversion to the hardened novel-reader, but they are useless to those whose interest is purely biographical. Another element in the romantic biography is the extensive use of psychological

[2] The Temple Bible (Dent and Co.).

* *Bunyan Calling: A Voice from the Seventeenth Century*, by M. P. Willcocks (Allen and Unwin. 12/6. 1943).

jargon and conjecture to furnish what the scanty supply of fact has omitted. It is more or less plausibly suggested that A must have done B, and then it is assumed a little later that A did B. No doubt this sort of thing is especially congenial to the feminine mind, traditionally incapable of logic, but it scarcely commends itself as evidence. Miss Wilcocks offers us a Freudian Bunyan, but we are spared the worst by her theory that Bunyan, in spite of two marriages, was afraid of women. Miss Willcocks also offers us a revolutionary Bunyan. Her own political views appear to be subversive in character, and she thinks that because Bunyan suffered at the hands of the ruling classes of his day that therefore he was hostile to the established order. She seems devoid of religious attachments, which is far from being a qualification for understanding a man whose religion was everything to him. But if she lacks sympathy with Anabaptism, she has a keen dislike of the Church of England of that day, which she regards as the accomplice of the rich in the oppression of the poor. In spite of these drawbacks, Miss Willcocks might have produced a useful book had she a close knowledge of the seventeenth century. But she even thinks that Mass was celebrated in Elstow Church (p. 18) in Bunyan's boyhood. Bunyan was born in 1628. The Mass was abolished in 1559. After this we are not surprised to be informed that at one point the Chiltern Hills rise to a height of eight thousand feet (p. 201). Bunyan may be calling, but the right wavelength is not indicated, though the publishers have inserted a B.B.C. advertisement on the dust cover.

P. R. SMYTHE.

DR. TENNANT'S FUNDAMENTALS

The name of F. R. Tennant on a book is sufficient for those who have already made his acquaintance to exclaim, 'I must have that.' His two large volumes on philosophical theology are among the precious possessions of the discriminating, but for me the name means much more than printed words. It takes my mind back to years ago in Cambridge when three times a week for two years his lecture room at Trinity was the scene not only of mental operations which enabled his hearers to see more clearly and to walk more surely, but of wondering appreciation on their part of the deftness of the surgeon. I can still thrill with admiration as I recall Dr. Tennant's perfect summary of each preceding lecture before he began the next one. Always clarity of thought was matched by lucidity of word. He hated ambiguities and the 'confoundings of things that differ.' It was more than an exercise in logic or a philosophy of religion we received from him; it was himself the prophet of enlightenment completely devoted to whatsoever things are true. Looking at him I was always reminded of Holbein's portrait of Erasmus; in both the features were as clear-cut as the thought. Whether my musings were but fanciful, and in whatever ways these learned ones differed, each of them has aimed in his day and generation at a genuine Christian Renaissance.

While, however, Erasmus urged that the source of renaissance was to be discovered in the writings of the New Testament and the works of the older Fathers of the Church, Tennant raises fundamental questions which must be answered before we can even tentatively discuss issues which theologians have been apt to take lightly in their dogmatic stride. His latest book, *The Nature of Belief*,* is concerned, as its title indicates, with one of them; or ought I to say with *the* one of them, since it is the very substratum of all succeeding strata? If we are in error here, no overgrowth of decorative symbolism or clinging dogmas will be able very long to hold up a tottering superstructure. This is a fact which even the makers and doers of the world cannot with safety dismiss in their efforts to create a new world: the realm of thought, pure and impure, is as powerful in its practical effects as is the pressure of a finger on

* *The Nature of Belief*, by F. R. Tennant, D.D., B.Sc., F.B.A. (The Centenary Press. 1943. 5/-.)

the trigger of a loaded gun. Hence, I should make the reading of this book compulsory for all intelligent citizens as well as politicians, for men of science as well as theologians. It would not be easy reading, and I can imagine many people asking Mr. Weller's question, 'Pursuit of knowledge under difficulties, Sammy?' But Dr. Tennant never allows his readers to avoid a difficulty, nor promises learning without tears. After all, truth is the most complex thing in the world; it is the half-truths which are simple.

The book begins with a discussion of the treatment of belief by logic and by psychology, and stress is laid on the distinction between logical certainty and psychological certitude. There is all the difference in the world between the statements 'It is certain that . . .' and 'I am certain that . . .' The complete convincedness of a person is not equivalent to the certainty of the truth-claim as to which he is convinced. Logic knows nothing of degrees of certainty, whereas in conviction we can pass in an ascending series from doubt to certitude. In this latter realm falsification is all too common, and there is need for caution and a critical mind; indeed, experimental doubting is an essential instrument in man's quest for truth. Further, it is necessary to distinguish between the meanings of 'reason' and 'rational' which are so often confused not only in ordinary speech but in some philosophical and theological writings. 'Rational' should be confined to what is logically certified and coercively proved, and it is concerned with deductive logic and certain cognition; 'reason' denotes the use of inductive logic and is based on probabilities involving the rational and the alogical. 'Not only is there "more in life than logic"; there is more in knowledge than logic, and more in reasonableness than ratiocination and rationality,' writes Dr. Tennant. Most reasonably he considers in the latter half of his book the problems of 'faith,' of an alleged immediate apprehension of the supersensible, of dogma and its development, and of authority and reason. Belief is assent to data, but faith creates its objects which are ideas, as the mathematician posits the entities with which he deals, and goes on in practical activity to discover their actuality; it is essentially an *As if* attitude demanding substantiation which is part of human nature and not a miraculously superadded endowment. In the chapter on the immediacy of apprehension claimed by the mystic and the appeal to religious experience it is rightly urged that at every stage in the development of religion the object of religious experience is derived by man from his knowledge of himself and the natural world. This is ever-changing, and doctrine which refuses to grow out of the embryonic stage and refuses any assimilation from outside itself is doomed to decay. Dr. Tennant's final appeal is both modern and fundamental:

> 'Among the various loyalties that are comprised in what many are apt to call their religion, a pre-eminent place should be given to the truth-loyalty. The genuinely religious man should love truth with a love like the love of home. It is the demand for truth and nothing but truth that motivates the desire in many persons to see a larger measure of attention bestowed by religious instructors on the most indubitable part of what they are commissioned to preach: namely, Christ's teaching, as profound and universal as it is simple, concerning God's personal relations with human persons. This component of the Christian gospel possesses the advantage of being independent of all disputation as to dates and authorship of sacred books, all unverifiable traditions and testimony, all questionable interpretations, and all psychological and metaphysical conceptions such as do not possess, for the present generation, the clarity and explanatory value that they seemed in the patristic age to possess . . . By His teaching and His earthly life Christ made explicit what is implicit in the ethical theism which is independent of personal experiences and their interpretations, and is based on knowledge, in all its breadth and depth, concerning the world and man.'

T. WIGLEY.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman*

THE PARSON'S WIFE

SIR,

The three following renderings into English of the noble Latin epitaph composed by Charles Wordsworth on his wife, quoted in your article, 'The Parson's Wife' (in the June *Modern Churchman*, p. 52), may be of interest to your readers:—

I.

Go, lost too early and beloved too well,
Go, since God calls thee, better though it be;
My spirit, which remains on earth to dwell,
Soul of my soul, must learn to follow thee.

(*C. Wordsworth.*)

II.

Too dearly loved, thy God hath called thee; go,
Go, thou best portion of this widowed heart:
And thou, poor remnant lingering here in woe,
So learn to follow as no more to part.

(*Lord Derby.*)

III.

Too fondly loved! God calls thee, go!
Go, our soul's better part!
Learn thou to follow — though so sadly slow —
Poor wretched remnant of a broken heart.

(*Anonymous.*)

Waterstock Rectory, Oxon. JOHN TODD.

SIR,

Your article, 'The Parson's Wife,' brought back to me the memory of a walk which I took many years ago with Sir Alfred Lyall to see Harbledown Rectory, his old home. He never lost his love for the place, though I believe his liberal views had pained his parents. As we walked back together, he stopped suddenly and said with a curious strength of conviction that in his opinion family life in an English parsonage was the highest achievement of Christian civilization.

A ROMAN CATHOLIC READER.

CORRECTION.

[In the *Modern Churchman*, Vol. XXXIII, p. 47, line 8 from top, instead of 'so wife does not occur in our English Authorized and Revised Versions,' *read* 'although *wife* occurs in the A.V. text, it was omitted from the R.V. text.'

Did Christ promise a reward to the man who forsook his wife for the sake of the Gospel?

In the Authorized Version, *Mark* x, 29, Christ is reported as saying: 'There is no one that hath left house, or brethren, or sisters, or father or mother, or *wife*, or children, or lands, for my sake and the Gospels, but he shall receive an hundredfold,' etc.

In the Revised Version of this passage 'wife' is omitted. This is due to its being absent from the most important Greek Codices and some of the Old Latin Codices. Compare Gould, p. 195, *St. Mark* (International Critical Commentary).

In the parallel passage in *Matthew* xix, 29, 'wife' occurs in the A.V. but in the R.V. it is taken out of the text and put in the margin. This is due to its being omitted by the Codices *Vaticanus, Bezae,* the *Sinaitic Syriac,* Origen, etc.

In the parallel passage in *Luke* xviii, 29, all Greek Codices and Versions appear to have 'wife' in the text. There is, however, a doubt as to whether it was there originally, since 'wife' occurs in a different order in the list of renunciations. That great textual critic, Dean White of Christ Church, maintained that even though a word or phrase occurred in every known Codex, yet if it occurred in different places in the text, it was a sure sign that it was not part of the original text.

As, however, there is a distinctly ascetic tendency in Luke's record of Christ's teaching, it would not surprise us to find 'wife' in *Luke,* of whom the earliest account (outside the New Testament) asserts that he was 'wifeless.' (See Anti-Marcionite Preface to Luke's Gospel, 150-180 A.D.)

The weight of this evidence seems plainly to be against Christ having promised a reward for wife-desertion on behalf of the Gospel.—ED., *M.C.*]

IN MEMORIAM: MISS A. K. WALKER

SIR,

By the death of Miss A. K. Walker, the Modern Churchmen's Union has lost a devoted member and her intimates a cultured and stimulating personality. A constant attendant at the M.C.U. Conferences, she had many friends among its members. She was a fine example of the modern educated Christian woman who dwells in many spiritual homes beside that provided by the National Church.

For instance, she found herself in intimate sympathy of thought and outlook with the Rev. Leslie Weatherhead, whose illuminating preaching appealed strongly to a vigorous and cultured mind: for years she played the organ of the Church of the Wisdom of God when residing at Kingswood, and afterwards at Reigate: she possessed antiquarian interests and was a friend of the late Sir Flinders Petrie: in 1908 she produced a beautiful illustrated volume on *The Fonts of Sussex*: she contributed an interesting paper on the English Mystics to her local branch of the Modern Churchmen's Union. She was a benefactress of Ripon Hall and left to its library a number of interesting books from her own.

An educationist by nature as by profession, her pupils will remember her influence with gratitude. Those of us who had the privilege of knowing her well found in her a fount of varied interests and the response of an enlightened soul possessed of an emancipated Christian view of life.

H. J. TRUEMAN.

Beaconsfield, Bucks.
November 25th, 1943.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION: COMING DEVELOPMENTS

SIR,

It seems certain that there will be insistence on Christian teaching being available for all boys and girls well into their 'teens; logically there will be a demand for satisfaction that the teachers concerned are adequately equipped for their purpose, and the genuine efficiency of their work tested. Just as logically, Education Authorities will have to see that their testing agents have genuinely equipped minds for their work. So far, so obvious.

For the parents and public, general statements will suffice. Whether themselves exerting religious influence in the home, as is their duty, or regretfully neglectful, ineffective and ignorant, parents as a whole are anxious to see their children developing characters more religiously endowed than their own. For the public as a whole, present national and international confusion has widely encouraged a conviction that religious teaching is essential in the scheme of what is necessary in the handling of the young.

Now for the teachers, who are, of course, the *primum mobile* of the system.

Freedom encouraged, and in its degree controlled, is for any teacher a *sine qua non*; and parents, public and authorities must value the freedom which every good teacher knows is essential for the welfare of the schools and the development of the individual. It is in the power of the teachers to hinder the cause which is so near to their heart and mind by a refusal to take any risks. If the State demands satisfaction as to efficiency, what becomes of promotion for such as, from shyness or other genuine reason, do not wish to engage in the direct imparting of religious knowledge? The full welfare of a school's pupils depends very much on its Head. Must the Head be always expected to be actively concerned in this direct imparting of Christian education and in leading Christian worship, and must there be therefore a limitation of chances of promotion? Must inspection be an examination of a teacher's own conscience? I mention the last question only to dismiss it. Of course, selection must always be influenced, *ceteris paribus*, by qualifications, tendencies, personality, and at least evidence of desire to use opportunity directly or indirectly to help in spiritual and religious growth of the pupils. Indifference to this, or anything like hostility, or intolerant tendency to exploit a particular view, ought to handicap selection. Otherwise 'freedom to build a boy or girl in body, mind and spirit' becomes a phantom. I believe that teachers as a whole (and parents and public in the 'unvocal' mass) are desirous of a defined Christianity, a Religious Community sense, and the cultivation of the capacity for worship.

Sooner or later the education of the majority of the youth of our country will continue well towards the end of their 'teens. Their personalities need to be strengthened in this formative, responsible, self-conscious period of their growing careers, however well or badly they have been taught in early, more receptive years.

The present Training College system must be widened in numbers and expanded in outlook and purpose; and teachers must be convinced that the State is at last constructively interested in the equipment of competent teachers of religion and is ready to encourage them; and University association, in varying degree, is not merely desirable but necessary.

At the heart of the problem lies the preservation of a right unbureaucratic freedom in all types of educational institution. Let us who are and have been teachers plead for this freedom (with its right measure of control) in the years of a listening, but not always well-informed, public.

(Canon) Stuart Blofeld, *Vicar of Edgbaston*
(formerly Principal of Saltley Training College).

BY WHAT AUTHORITY?

Sir,

It may be that Christianity will meet a crisis in the post-war age. There will be problems for which the world has no real solution, and men will then, as they have before, turn to the Church for light and leading. How far will the New Testament throw light on that path? By what authority shall we do the things which must be done?

When our Lord came to this world three great festering sores were eating away the life of mankind. The first was the degradation of women, the second was the scourge of slavery, and the third was the brutality of war. But in preaching the kingdom of God, our Lord never attacked these evils by name, neither did He appeal to proof texts from the Old Testament; but He gave men a new spirit — the Holy Spirit who should guide them into all truth. When James and John appealed to the Old Testament in their desire to call down fire from heaven, Jesus rebuked them: 'Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of' (*Lk.* ix, 54). Christ preached and proved by His life and death the inestimable value of a human soul in the sight of God, and the sanctity of personality.

Before his conversion, Saul of Tarsus lived by the rule of a static law; but after, his authority was 'the mind of Christ,' and he insisted that God had

made him 'an able minister of the New Testament, not of the letter but of the spirit; for the letter killeth but the spirit giveth life' (*I Cor.* iii, 6). The Spirit of Christ brought in a new age, in which the position of women became changed; not all at once, for Peter could advise Christian women to be 'in subjection to their own husbands' whilst he gave the same advice to slaves 'to be in subjection to their masters' even though those masters be evil, and subjects were to 'submit themselves to every ordinance' of the king, even though he be an arch-fiend Nero (*I Peter* ii, iii). Paul wrote much in the same strain. But are we to regard this as a static law, disregarding all the teaching about the 'honour due to all men,' because God is the Father of all and with Him there is no respect of persons? The love of Christ has led the Church to lift womanhood from the degrading position of a slave, but it tolerated slavery for some eighteen centuries. No one can read the *Epistle to Philemon* without feeling something of the death-blow dealt to a vile system by that phrase, 'a brother beloved,' and feel the leading of the mind of Christ; and yet it is said that 'Roman slavery at its worst was a humane institution compared with the slavery of the negroes in America until 1860' (Dr. Hunter, *Roman Law*, p. 19). Doubtless the slave-owners could appeal to passages of the New Testament, but not to the Spirit of Brotherhood in Christ.

The trouble with the sixteenth century was that it too often appealed to a static law of Old and New Testament, and did violence to the Spirit and Mind of Christ.

Martin Luther, himself a peasant, answered Art. 3 of the 'Peasant's Revolt' by reference to Old Testament slavery as thereby being justified, and he lamented the fact that refractory servants could not now be treated 'like other cattle.' When Philip of Hesse appealed to the Reformers for permission to divorce his wife, they refused as being contrary to Scripture, but were willing that he should take a second wife as the Old Testament allowed it and the New did not expressly condemn it except for deacons! Calvin wrote what amounted to a military text-book based on the Bible, but it had little reference to the Sermon on the Mount, and the law of Geneva was cruel in the extreme.

To-day, after nearly two thousand years, two of those festering sores are almost healed: women with men are 'joint-heirs of the grace of life'; slavery as a system is extinct. But war, so far from diminishing, has become infinitely greater in extent and more devilish in kind. Shall we seek the solution of this and other problems in isolated texts of a static law, or shall we rather seek the mind of Christ as a living law in the hearts of those who love Him?

The Vicarage, Osterley. R. F. WRIGHT.

SIR,

INTERCOMMUNION: WHOSE TABLE?

While reading the Rev. W. G. Fallows' paper on 'National Christian Reunion' and his plea for intercommunion I remembered a story I heard in my youth of the Rev. Roland Hill, a noted Nonconformist of last century. He had preached by invitation in a chapel of another denomination, and during the service one of the deacons announced that following it there would be 'The Lord's Supper,' and he most cordially invited his brethren to be partakers of it.

During the short interval between the services when the officials retired to the vestry, Roland Hill expressed his desire to join them in the Holy Communion. After whispering with his companions, one of the deacons turned and said: 'Mr. Hill, we are deeply indebted to you for your helpful and eloquent sermon, but we regret to say that we cannot invite you to our table.' 'Oh,' said Roland Hill, 'I thought that you invited all of us to be guests at "The Lord's Table," but evidently I was mistaken. As it is your table, and not His, I will say good evening.'

EDWARD H. LEALE (retd. Vicar).

Battle, Sussex.
October 17th, 1943.